

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 22, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Simcha Freedman, Adath Yeshurun Synagogue, Miami, FL, offered the following prayer:

Dear G-d, in Pirke Avot, Ethics of the Fathers, we learn that the world endures due to three principles: truth, justice, and peace.

The Declaration of Independence states that "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Dear G-d, while the distinguished Members of this House of Representatives, upon whom we ask Thy blessings, while they defend and support those self-evident truths, there are yet those individuals and even nations who do not.

Some would deny the principle of life by savagely killing innocent people, others would defy the principle of liberty, thus creating refuseniks and prisoners of conscience.

Adlai Stevenson once said, "Man cannot reduce the truth to ashes, he may murder his fellow man with a shot in the back, but he does not murder justice * * *."

Dear G-d, we have faith that truth, justice, and peace shall yet prevail despite the fulminations of those who so viciously attempt to prevent it.

We believe the dream is real and that it will come to fruition due to those brave peoples who fight against tyranny and terrorism. They are the last best hope of mankind.

G-d, bless America. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3038. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3038) "An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GARN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. LAUTENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RABBI SIMCHA FREEDMAN

(Mr. LEHMAN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a warm welcome to Rabbi Simcha Freedman and to thank him for officiating in the opening prayer today in the U.S. House of Representatives.

My good friend of many years, Rabbi Freedman is the spiritual leader of Temple Adath Yeshurun of the city of North Miami Beach. His involvement in the community has over the years cast him as a true leader on behalf of human rights and other humanitarian concerns. His activism on Soviet Jewry is especially notable. Through his efforts, the street address of Temple Adath Yeshurun was changed to be known as Shcharansky Boulevard to symbolize the continued incarceration of Anatoly Shcharansky by the Soviet Union, and the utter abuse of his human rights.

Rabbi Freedman's congregation is testimony to the pivotal role he has played in building Temple Adath Yeshurun as one of the most dynamic congregations in Miami. Its beautiful day care center, public events, and other services enable its large community to enjoy a full spectrum of activities.

Once again, on behalf of my colleagues, I welcome Rabbi Simcha Freedman and thank him for honoring us this morning.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES WARRANT SUSPENSION OF ROMANIA'S MFN

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, and myself, I am today introducing legislation to suspend most-favored-nation [MFN] status to Romania for 6 months on account of egregious human rights violations in that country.

Romania, Mr. Speaker, has enjoyed MFN since 1975. Annual trade between our two countries amounts to approximately \$1 billion and the Romanians export more than they import by a ratio of more than 4 to 1.

In exchange for these considerable enhancements to the Romanian economy, the United States hopes the Ceausescu regime will act more independently of the Soviet Union in foreign policy matters, while adhering to international human rights standards at home.

While it is clear that the Romanians have demonstrated at best some willingness and ability to digress from hardline Soviet policy—Romania sent a team to the Olympics in Los Angeles—their record on human rights is shameful.

Four months ago, Mr. HALL, Mr. WOLF, and I went on a factfinding mission to Romania sponsored by Christian Response International. We met with high Government leaders including Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei and religious leaders in an attempt to better understand the reality of what is occurring there. We came away deeply concerned over the human rights situation, especially the systematic persecution of Christians, the bulldozing of churches and other repressive actions by the Government.

On the one hand, we note with joy that since our return, Father Gheorghe Calciu, the Orthodox priest who spent more than 20 years in prison for his faith in Christ, has been permitted to emigrate to the United States. On the other hand, rather than moving toward an easing up on rights violations, Romania is cracking down.

It is sad but true that the Romanian Government tolerates no domestic criticism, no opposition, no dissent from its policies. There are massive controls of all forms of the media, freedom of speech, and movement within and without the country. Furthermore, citizens are prohibited the right to assemble unless specific permission is granted by the Government. Of course, that permission is only se-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

cured when the Government has insured that the activity will serve the interests of the Communist Party. Christians are singled out for arrest and imprisonment. Groups like Amnesty International have raised concerns over beatings and psychiatric abuse against prisoners of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this action is necessary—but it is. The leaders in Bucharest must come to recognize that the United States is only insisting that Romania keep its word as a signatory to the Helsinki Accords. Respect for human rights isn't optional; it is fundamental, and is the only legitimate basis for genuine bilateral relations.

ALEX ODEH, AN ARAB-AMERICAN VOICE OF MODERATION

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, almost unnoted by the Nation's press, a terrorist bombing killed a good and gentle college professor on October 11, 1985. It happened not on the high seas, but in Santa Ana, CA.

Now Alex Odeh's 2-year-old daughter, Suzanne, will never know her father as do her 5- and 7-year-old sisters, Samia and Helena.

His three daughters will never know, as I know, the great decency and the exemplary humaneness of their father.

He condemned terrorism in all its forms; instead, he advocated peaceful dialog. Alex was a Catholic. However, when a memorial service was requested for Alex, at the University of San Francisco, a Catholic university, the president denied the request.

To no avail, I urged a change of mind. Why the refusal? Fear. Fear of reprisal. Extremists silenced a voice of moderation. To our shame, they also intimidated the leader of an institution symbolic of fairness and compassion. Has terrorism won? It cannot be allowed to be so.

The whole Nation must mourn equally and fearlessly the killings of Alex Odeh and Leon Kinghoffer. If we do not, then we should begin to mourn for ourselves, because we will have become the victims of terrorism.

INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1985

(Mr. McCAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies in America today is the conditions that exist on our Indian reservations: unemployment, poverty, and despair throughout many of our reservations in America.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Indian Economic Development Act of 1985, which I believe can bring new hope and prosperity to all native Americans.

Poverty is a way of life on many reservations. Drug and alcohol abuse is rampant. Limited education portends a life of functional illiteracy and unemployment for many Indian people. Passage of this legislation offers a different choice—a path toward hope rather than despair. It will encourage Indian tribes to work with the business community to create jobs, provide employment training, and initiate long-term economic development. The Indian Economic Development Act would provide for the designation of certain tribal lands as enterprise zones, thus encouraging economic self-sufficiency and reducing Indian dependency on Federal assistance.

One of the biggest problems faced by reservations is the reluctance of businesses to invest. This legislation would serve as a catalyst—spurring investment, creating jobs, and fostering entrepreneurship.

The Indian Economic Development Act offers the Nation's tribes the opportunity to join forces with the private sector to build a better life. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

S. 49 WOULD BENEFIT ASSASSINS, NOT SPORTSMEN

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, easy access to guns has left a trail of tragedy and violence through our Nation's recent history. President Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, President Ford, and President Reagan have all suffered from the assassin's touch. And daily we hear of new tragedies affecting our neighborhoods and our communities.

Legislation which will enable the Lee Harvey Oswalds, Sirhan Sirhans, John Hinckleys, and street-corner muggers alike to easily obtain untraceable firearms is now pending in committee. Efforts are being made to bring it directly to the floor for a vote.

Every major law enforcement group in the country opposes this legislation.

S. 49 is being sold as a "sportsman's bill," but in hearings, a far different picture would emerge. S. 49 would allow the interstate sale of handguns for the first time since 1968, prohibit

surprise inspection visits to handgun dealers, and permit dealers to sell guns from their personal and private collections. These provisions are not provisions for sportsmen but are provisions for criminals.

I urge my colleagues to oppose all efforts to bring S. 49 to the floor without adequate hearings.

HOUSING ACT OF 1985, A HALLOWEEN TRICK, NOT A TREAT

(Mr. GROTEBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROTEBERG. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1, the Housing Act of 1985 included in title II of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act is the only major authorization bill included by a major committee in the reconciliation process.

I find it only fitting that the House is considering this important legislation on the advent of Halloween. If H.R. 1 prevails and gets passed under the cloak of the reconciliation bill, the American taxpayers will be getting the "trick" while the 30 majority members of the Housing Banking Committee will be getting the "treat." The "trick" will be that major housing legislation would pass the House by the say of only 30 House Members. This would be the biggest "trick" played on our democratic process that I have seen in a long time. The "treat" will go to the 30 majority members of the House Banking Committee who had the only say in modifying H.R. 1 for reconciliation purposes.

I ask my colleagues—something must be wrong with H.R. 1 if the majority members of the Banking Committee view the reconciliation process as their best and only hope for congressional passage of the Housing Act this year. This alone should be a signal for the 405 Members of the Congress to question what is contained in the housing bill.

If the provisions contained in H.R. 1 are so contentious that they must be hidden in an omnibus reconciliation bill what will this do to assure a timely conference between the House and Senate?

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the spirit of deficit reduction—let's not have any "tricks or treats" this year.

□ 1215

THE GREAT AMERICAN SPIRIT OF PATRIOTISM

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, several events of the past few weeks have rekindled that great American spirit of patriotism—none more so than the

recent awards to American Nobel laureates. One of the most inspiring individuals in this esteemed group is Prof. Franco Modigliani of MIT, winner of the Nobel Prize for economics. His pioneering work in the area of savings comes at a most opportune time for the Nation—a period where Americans are saving less, borrowing more, and staring at a \$2 trillion national debt. Professor Modigliani's work should serve as a clarion call to all Americans, especially those of us shaping economic policy.

It is in this spirit that I will soon be introducing legislation which enlists U.S. savings bonds in the battle to reverse this dangerous trend and literally "buy back America." The legislation will declare 1986 as "Save for the U.S.A." year, calling on the President to elevate to national prominence a major national savings bond drive that can help increase savings and reduce our Federal deficit, and wean ourselves off our growing unwise dependence on foreign credit. I hope my colleagues will join in this most valuable savings and investment endeavor for our country's future.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST ANGOLA

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, according to Amnesty International, the Communist regime in Angola is brutal and routinely violates human rights. It has been engaged for more than 10 years in a civil war with the anti-Marxist forces of Jonas Savimbi. There are more than 30,000 Cuban troops in Angola supporting the Communists and there are also 1,500 Soviets and 2,500 East Germans. The Soviet Union has supplied the Angolan Government with sophisticated aircraft, tanks, and other weapons.

Incredibly, the United States has been financing the Angolan Government through United States investment there, Export-Import Bank loans and by more than \$1 billion of imports each year including the purchase of more than 80 percent of oil produced in Angola. This is immoral and indefensible.

I am introducing legislation today that bans future U.S. business investment in Angola, prohibits loans to Angola, and requires the President to embargo all trade with Angola unless certain conditions are met. Among those conditions are significant efforts to improve human rights, free elections, and the withdrawal of all Cuban, Soviet, and other foreign Communist troops.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation. We must stop this outrage.

THE RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider the Reconciliation Act, which is supposed to be our chief effort in this Congress to cut Federal spending and thereby cut the Federal deficit. We all know that among the serious provisions to do that in that bill are some provisions that are, in fact, going to be very costly to the U.S. Government and to the U.S. taxpayer. One of those is the outrageous giveaway of future revenues earned on the Outer Continental Shelf that will be given to several States. This provision was not envisioned in the budget resolution. It will make it very hard in the future for us to carry out our responsibilities in reducing future deficits, and I am sorry to say the House Rules Committee refused by a vote of 7 to 6 to let the entire House vote on this serious matter.

Tomorrow, as the House considers the rule on reconciliation, I hope Members will recognize that voting "yes" will prove costly to balancing the budget in the future.

OPPOSE DISCHARGE PETITION ON FIREARMS OWNERS PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, rarely a day goes by when the news does not recite incidents of violent crime. Americans everywhere live with the fear that they could be the next victim of some life-threatening criminal act.

If there is one proposal that Congress could adopt that would do more to curb street crime than any other, it would be strong handgun control legislation. Until handguns are outlawed, every outlaw can get a handgun. Unfortunately, S. 49, the Senate-passed Firearms Owners Protection Act, would take us in the opposite direction—backward in the fight against violent crime.

The Nation's major law enforcement organizations have pointed out that S. 49 would significantly undermine law enforcement; yet S. 49 was never even considered at the committee level in the other body.

Now an attempt is being made in the House to bypass the committee process here and bring S. 49 to the floor by means of a discharge petition, even though the House Judiciary Committee has already announced that it will begin comprehensive hearings next week.

One citizen who has been invited to testify at those hearings is Sarah

Brady, wife of Presidential Press Secretary Jim Brady. In a letter to Members of Congress urging them to let the Judiciary Committee hearings take place, Mrs. Brady writes:

Now I must ask you to allow all our voices to be heard on this issue. I have so much to say—please listen.

Out of respect for Sarah and Jim Brady and the hundreds of thousands of other Americans who have been threatened, maimed, or killed by handguns, I urge Members not to sign the discharge petition on S. 49.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY WAGE ACT OF 1985

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, President Reagan sent a message to the Congress urging the enactment of the Youth Employment Opportunity Wage Act of 1985. I share his sentiments that one of the Nation's longstanding problems is providing adequate employment opportunities for our young people. Even in our times of economic prosperity, unemployment among our youth remains a problem. Through this legislation, we can make it possible for employers to expand job opportunities for young people during the summer months.

Aside from the fact that it is a sound proposal, crafted to create 400,000 summer youth jobs across the country at no additional cost to taxpayers, this bill represents a principle I find critical to the character development of our young people. That is the basic good that comes from learning responsibility and learning to adapt to a variety of people and situations. Positive experiences in the workplace can help teach important values—values which are central to success later in life. It teaches an ethic that is basic to the American society. Our young people need an opportunity to be part of that American ethic. I urge my colleagues to examine this legislation carefully and to enact it speedily.

LEON KLINGHOFFER

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Leon Klinghoffer represented what is best in America. He was a courageous and determined man who fought injustice all his life. During the Second World War, he served his country in the Army Air Corps. After the war, he realized a dream of millions of Americans—starting with little more than their own ingenuity and determination, he and his brother built a compa-

ny to manufacture a product which they themselves had invented. As a philanthropist, he then shared his good fortune generously with others.

In recent years, partly paralyzed by a stroke, he refused to accept the limitations of his disability. He set for himself the goal of escorting his daughter Ilsa at her wedding 2 months hence, and had he lived he would not have rested until he had achieved that goal.

When he was attacked by the *Achille Lauro* terrorists, Leon Klinghoffer, disabled as he was, resisted courageously.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that we honor this brave American. Together with Senator ALPHONSE D'AMATO of New York, I am, therefore, introducing legislation to confer the Congressional Gold Medal of Achievement on Leon Klinghoffer posthumously. I invite all Members of the House to join me as cosponsors.

A NEW SYSTEM FOR FILING TAX RETURNS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Halloween this year began on April 15, when we began hearing horror stories from our taxpayers on the treatment they have been receiving from the various IRS offices throughout the country, reports of missed and misfiled returns, refunds delayed, threats of liens and legal action on the part of the IRS, all kinds of horror stories. Not all of them can be blamed on the computer gremlins or ghosts that the IRS talks about. Part of it has to do with the fact that 100 million returns have to be filed every year by April 15.

I have proposed today to the Ways and Means Committee that we eliminate the filing date of April 15 and spread out the filing dates across the year through a system of staggered returns, to become compiled on the basis of the taxpayer's birth date. It is worth considering. It can end that crush on April 15 and take us a long way toward simplifying the system of tax filing that we now have.

I urge the Members of the House to ask their individual members on the Ways and Means Committee to foster this plan. It is about time we tried to do something.

TIME ZONE ISSUE

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as we begin consideration of the Daylight Saving Extension Act, I would like to

bring to your attention a dilemma regarding time that my constituents of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana are now facing due to the Federal bureaucracy. Back in June, the Department of Transportation published a notice of proposed rulemaking regarding a change in the time zone boundary for southwestern Indiana.

Public hearings were conducted in July throughout the affected area and public comments were solicited until August 20. It has now been 2½ months since the close of the comment period and no decision has been issued by DOT. Furthermore, DOT has refused to say when a decision will be forthcoming. My constituents are wondering how to resolve their paramount concern of scheduling. Businesses, airlines, school districts, farmers, and citizens alike are anxiously waiting for a resolution of this issue.

DOT officials have demonstrated their indifference and disregard for the Hoosiers of southwestern Indiana. The excessive delay in the decision-making process has disrupted the schedules of the five counties and is intolerable. The DOT's lack of action reflects on all of the Federal Government and is simply inexcusable.

A TIME FOR ACTION

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, history books record that the "Reign of Terror" took place in France following the overthrow of the monarchy, when Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette had to eat crow instead of cake.

What we are finding, however, is that we are in the midst of another reign of terror: repeated violence directed against American citizens and property by international terrorists.

As a nation and as civilized human beings, we are morally outraged at the perpetration of these cruel and vicious crimes. We are also angry and frustrated because there seems to be no way to either prevent them from happening or apprehend those responsible.

As a result, there was some cause for national rejoicing when the four hijackers of the *Achille Lauro* were captured and turned over to Italian authorities to stand trial. It is not revenge that we seek, but justice.

Too often, we find ourselves impotent in the face of terrorist attacks. We can cheer when an occasional hijacker is captured, but far too many of these criminal acts go unanswered. We need to take action similar to that which President Carter took during the black days of the Iranian hostage crisis: freeze the assets of those responsible for the crimes.

I will be taking a special order tonight to address the matter of how to deal with terrorist organizations, and I will be introducing a resolution toward this end. It's time we took action.

DISCHARGE PETITION FILED ON FIREARM OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, September 10, 1979, during the 96th Congress, I first introduced the Firearm Owners' Protection Act—181 of my colleagues joined me as cosponsors.

In each succeeding Congress I have introduced the legislation with as many as 180 cosponsors. But during this time in the House there has never been a committee hearing on the legislation despite my repeated requests.

In the meantime in each Congress the senior Senator from Idaho has introduced the legislation in the other body. On July 9 of this year the other body passed their version of the legislation by a 70-to-15 vote. The next day the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee was quoted as saying the bill was "dead on arrival."

The only recourse left to us is the filing of a discharge petition to enable the Firearm Owners' Protection Act to be brought to the House.

I have today filed a petition to discharge House Resolution 290 enabling the legislation to be brought to the floor for consideration by my colleagues. I ask you to join me in signing the Discharge Petition No. 4.

This evening I am taking a special order to discuss this issue and I invite you to join me in that discussion.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS TIRADES OF DANIEL ORTEGA

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Nicaraguan dictator, Daniel Ortega, is now claiming that his order to suspend all remaining civil liberties in his country was due to the "genocide" being practiced by the United States against his nation, can you believe that?

This is the same man who, dressed in a military uniform, appeared before the United Nations last year and declared the United States was planning an imminent invasion of Nicaragua.

While Mr. Ortega seems to make headlines with these pronouncements, he has never made much sense. And I hope the foreign leaders at the United Nations and we here in Congress recognize this man and his statements for what they truly represent. Daniel

Ortega is a Marxist revolutionary who came to power behind the barrel of a gun, reinforced his position by winning his office in a sham election, and last week enhanced it even more by suspending what was left of his people's civil rights. He is beholden to Moscow and Cuba. And we all remember his comments and recent trip to the Soviet Union requesting \$200 million in arms immediately after a \$14 million economic Contra aid package failed by a vote here in Congress.

I'd suggest that the news media and the Congress listen more to what the administration has to say about this man and his Marxist government; than to the ridiculous assertions and public relations tirades of Daniel Ortega.

THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IS BREAKING THE LAW

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government is breaking the law. The Department of Commerce, which makes purchases for the national defense stockpile, has been purchasing illegally dumped titanium. A titanium manufacturer in my district, the RMI Co., recently won an antidumping suit before the International Trade Commission against the Japanese.

Based on this decision, the Commerce Department imposed antidumping duties. Therefore, under current U.S. trade law, it is clear that these titanium purchases made by our own Commerce Department are undercutting U.S. industries, and I might add, illegally.

Yet, this administration persists in its previous practice of purchasing this illegally dumped titanium. It is crazy, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government is literally helping foreign countries put American industries out of business by purchasing illegally dumped goods. It is a shame that even our own Government is wrecking American industry. Why need we fear foreign competition when America's own Government is wrecking our own industry?

I believe something should be done and the President should react to this purchasing of illegally dumped titanium.

THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY WAGE ACT OF 1985

(Mr. NIELSON of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1811, the Youth Employment Opportunity

Wage Act of 1985, and ask that immediate action be taken on this legislation.

H.R. 1811 would permit employers to pay young people under 20 years of age, from May 1 through September 30, a wage of no less than either 75 percent of the otherwise applicable minimum wage or \$2.50 per hour, whichever is less. This bill provides protections so that adult workers or previously hired youth will not be adversely affected by the proposal. It also prohibits employers from substituting youth for current employees. Employers who discharge, transfer, or demote workers for the purpose of employing eligible youth are subject to various legal remedies and sanctions, including a \$10,000 fine, 6 months in prison, and payment of back wages.

The summer youth employment opportunity offers the promise of employment to potentially hundreds of thousands of young people currently denied the chance to gain experience, self confidence, effective work habits, and income for one's labor and I rise in support of H.R. 1811 and ask, again, that immediate action be taken on this legislation.

ELDERLY AND MEDICARE COST INCREASES

(Mr. BONER of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I stood on the floor of this House on May 1 to express my opposition to any further Medicare cutbacks and a Social Security cost-of-living allowance freeze. These increases, as my colleagues know, are the result of the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, a bill I voted against.

Since my speech in May, we have been successful in defeating many of the administration's proposals. As a result, the elderly are going to get a cost-of-living allowance, and their monthly Medicare premiums will not increase. Nonetheless, I am very concerned that beginning in 1986 they are now going to have to pay \$492 for their first day's stay in the hospital. That is an increase of \$92 from the 1985 rate.

Out-of-pocket health care costs for the elderly have risen at the rate of 11.4 percent per year since 1980. With only an average 3.5-percent Social Security cost-of-living allowance the elderly are out 8 percent annually. Being sick enough to have to be hospitalized is traumatic enough for an older person, but having to struggle and worry about how to finance that first day in the hospital is a double burden. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we here in Congress act to relieve the elderly of some of these burdens.

AMERICAN HOSTAGE CRISIS IN 595TH DAY

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 595th day Americans have been held hostage in Lebanon.

William Buckley, a U.S. Foreign Service officer, was kidnapped in Beirut on March 16, 1984, 595 days ago today. Today marks the 288th day Father Lawrence Jenco has been held hostage.

Terry Anderson, the Beirut bureau chief for the Associated Press, was taken hostage in Lebanon 220 days ago.

David Jacobsen, director of the American University hospital in Beirut, was kidnapped 146 days ago.

The dean of the American University agriculture school, Thomas Sutherland, was taken hostage 135 days ago.

Today also marks the 324th day since the disappearance of Peter Kilburn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, the American hostage crisis is now in its 595th day. It started long before the hijacking of the Italian cruise ship and the mid-air capture of the hijackers. It won't end until all the Americans held hostage in Lebanon are back home safe and sound.

Please God, let them go free—and soon.

PETITION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FROM CONSIDERATION OF S. 49 AND H.R. 945

(Mr. HUGHES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to sign a discharge petition on S. 49. Such a petition is not appropriate. This legislation is not being bottled up or held hostage.

The Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, will be holding hearings on this and related bills next Monday, in New York City.

After we complete our hearings, I expect to report consensus legislation—that accommodates the concerns of hunters and sportsmen as well as our police and other concerned citizens, and which does not weaken our Nation's fight against violent crime.

Don't short circuit the legislative process on these important issues. Discharge will prevent careful examination of the consequences of S. 49. It prevents any amendment. Surely the supporters of S. 49 are not afraid of a fair examination of the bill in hearings.

There are problems with S. 49, which was not subject to hearings in

the other body, and which was not referred to or considered by committee. Just one example is that S. 49 would undercut the 5-year mandatory prison term that we enacted last year to punish those who carry or use a firearm in the commission of a crime of violence. If the discharge petition prevails, we could not correct that serious mistake.

The Nation's police officers are opposed to this legislation. They, who face armed criminals on the streets and highways every day, believe that S. 49, as it is now written, would make it easier for criminals to get firearms.

Before you sign onto this petition, make sure you listen to the facts. Check with the chiefs of police and sheriffs and police officers in your district.

You will find it is not prudent to sign the discharge petition on S. 49.

□ 1240

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD RECEIVE SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address an issue that is of great importance to all of us. Many times we in this House pass legislation that we regret later on, and I think one of the reasons for that is that we have not adequately reflected on the legislation or because we have not adequately studied it.

Tomorrow we walk into such a bear trap. Tomorrow the House will take up the Budget Reconciliation Act, and my colleagues should know that this particular act will contain the 1985 housing legislation, H.R. 1. H.R. 1 is always the legislative flagship of the Democratic Party; and it is going to be passed under a false flag.

H.R. 1 must be debated on its merits. H.R. 1 involves not millions of dollars but billions of dollars. There is no way we can vote on this legislation without adequate debate and say that we are concerned about the deficit and concerned about balancing the budget. This bill has 227 pages of substantive legislative language affecting housing and community development programs, and it should not be subject to one up or down, vote.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members to review this legislation. To look at the Latta amendment, and to reflect on the Latta amendment which is going to strike the nongermane legislative language, the new programs, and the add-ons from the reconciliation bill. There is no way we can pass this legislation with a good conscience unless we give it appropriate and due consideration. We are not going to do that if

we pass it as part of the Reconciliation Act.

KAISA RANDPERE, PERHAPS THE WORLD'S YOUNGEST POLITICAL PRISONER

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, let me introduce Kaisa Randpere. As you can see from this picture, she is adorable. She is 2 years old. She is Estonian, and she is not allowed to leave the Soviet Union to rejoin her parents who left the Soviet Union for freedom in the West.

I met her father, Valdo Randpere, going into Russia recently. I met him in Sweden, and he asked me and he asked my colleagues in Congress to help to free this young girl, this 2-year-old, who may well be the world's youngest political prisoner.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BRIAN DONNELLY, and I, cochairpersons of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, will be circulating a letter of support for easing Kaisa's plight. We hope the Members will sign it. The Helsinki accords which the Soviet Union has signed allow for family reunification as an important part. And regarding the upcoming summit, is not the adherence to past agreements necessary to make new agreements credible?

POLICE SEEK SUPPORT IN OPPOSING DISCHARGE PETITION ON GUN DECONTROL

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, today as Members of the House enter the Chamber they will be greeted by policemen, policemen from around the United States. They will be pleading with the Members of this body to pause before signing a discharge petition to bring gun decontrol to the floor of this House.

This discharge petition is an attempt to avoid scrutiny, and we should understand their strategy. Their strategy is that if you knew that it allowed the private sale of firearms, you would not vote for the legislation. If you knew that it restricted the inspections and that it weakened jail sentences for violators, you would not support the legislation. The fact is that if you sign this discharge petition and bring it to the floor of this House, you never will know what is in the legislation.

I ask the Members today to support the police—in fact, every police organization in this country. Let our commit-

tee process work. Let this legislation be subjected to full scrutiny.

Many Members of this institution have come to this floor, to this pulpit, many times to speak in support of law enforcement, and they have come here to speak against crime. If you believe those words and you stand for law enforcement in America, join us in our efforts. Pledge yourselves not to sign this discharge petition and let the Judiciary Committee give this legislation full scrutiny.

COLORADO SKI COUNTRY

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, along the Continental Divide of Colorado, modern-day pioneers have forged new settlements out of a magical alpine landscape.

After World War II, a few tiny ski resorts and fading mining towns blossomed into a fabulous new industry that today is the biggest single business on Colorado's western slope.

Over the past 30 years the number of skiers in Colorado has increased dramatically. Last year Colorado Ski Country U.S.A., the industry's promotional arm, counted 9 million skier days at the State's 32 areas.

Mr. Speaker, there is a simple reason, a reason that even beckons to some of us inside the beltway on a crisp morning. Fleeting white frosts that touch Washington first visit the Rockies in early autumn, then cover them with a deep mantle of light power snow that glistens on our alpine runs into May.

We like to keep our Colorado memories alive in my office, Mr. Speaker—1331 Longworth serves as Colorado's ski information center for the Congress, and we invite anyone to stop by or call our office for daily ski reports.

The Third District of Colorado also extends a warm invitation to see for yourself.

□ 1250

TROUBLE IN THE PHILIPPINES

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished gentleman from the other body will confer with his friend, the President, on the results of his trip to the Philippines. The President would be wise to heed his friend and listen to the message that America faces nothing but trouble in the Philippines in the future.

Can the Philippines become another Iran or Nicaragua? Unfortunately, yes, it can. In both those cases, a despot

became increasingly isolated from the people of his country and an authoritarian movement sprung up like the grass and took over that country. That is happening now in the Philippines.

President Marcos has lost his support, not only of the poor peasants in the outer islands, but of the business community and the upper class. Many of these Filipinos want to reject both Marcos and communism. But the administration has persisted in the view that the only opposition to Marcos right now is the Communist insurgency. It is the duty of this Government, it is our obligation, as well as in our interest, to reach out to those Filipinos who reject both Marcos and communism, to foster a middle way.

An amendment which passed the foreign aid bill allows our Government to send economic aid, not through the Marcos government, where much of it will be funneled to the wrong uses, but rather through third parties, through the Catholic Church and private voluntary organizations. Not only will the aid be used better that way, but it will send a clear message to the Philippine people that the United States does not endorse Marcos, but seeks a true democratic middle way.

DESIGNATING 1986 AS "THE YEAR OF THE FLAG"

(Mr. COBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, America has much to commemorate in 1986. The refurbished Statue of Liberty will be dedicated, and we mark the 200th anniversary of the call for a constitutional convention. But our greatest symbol, the flag, has gone unnoticed—until now.

I come before the House to focus attention on a bipartisan effort conceived by Dr. Elinor Massoglia of North Carolina Central University, to designate 1986 as "The Year of the Flag."

By designating 1986 as "The Year of the Flag," Congressman EDOLPHUS TOWNS and I seek to heighten awareness and interest in the relationship of the flag to our American heritage.

The flag is a living symbol of America's ideals, traditions, and unity. The flag stands for the values and purity of self-sacrifice that made this Nation great.

I urge all the distinguished Members of this body to join us in cosponsoring a resolution to make 1986 "The Year of the Flag."

SUSPENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR ROMANIA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman SMITH from New Jersey and Congressman TONY HALL from Ohio and myself introduced legislation which would suspend for 6 months the most-favored-nation status agreement with the country of Romania.

The reason we have done that, the three of us have visited Romania. We talked to so many people who have told us of the persecution there. The Romanian Government has bulldozed churches. They have beaten people. They have had Father Calciu in prison for 21 years and did so many horrible things to him. They put individuals in body presses, in torture machines, in black boxes, and many other things.

We in this Congress, I think appropriately so, took action on the question of South Africa. I now appeal to my colleagues that here we have an opportunity to take action with regard to Romania. We give them most-favored-nation status. Let us suspend it unless they act in a positive way.

This is a very moderate approach. Some want to cut it off permanently. We are saying let us cut it off for 6 months.

I would ask that when given the opportunity to cosponsor this legislation, please do.

The people of Romania told us that by the very nature of the fact that we have introduced this and are working to pass it, it offers hope and I think if we do this and pass this that we can bring the Romanian Government to loosen up a little bit and allow these people to worship in freedom and not be persecuted for their beliefs; so I hope you will take this opportunity to cosponsor the legislation.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL IS A HOLLOW BOOK

(Mr. WORTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will take up a reconciliation bill aimed at reducing the deficit. Members may be a bit surprised when they take a look at this bill. For many, it may resemble one of those thick books which can be bought at a novelty gift store—we've all seen them—these books are hollowed out in the middle so their owner can stash anything he likes inside the book from a flask to a derringer while he goes about looking studious and well read.

This budget reconciliation bill tomorrow is a bit like those books. For inside this massive bill in the void is stored the entire contents of H.R. 1, the Federal housing authorization bill, which was marked up by the Banking Committee last July. However, the version included is not the same bill we marked up and reported. It contains substantially different spending

levels than the ones we approved during a lengthy, 8-day markup process.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very real possibility that this housing title could severely delay an agreement with the other body on budget reconciliation, and reduction of the deficit would be further waylaid.

Mr. Speaker, it is the current enormous deficit that continues to put pressure on interest rates and props up the overvalued dollar, killing U.S. farmers, exporters, and manufacturers.

We need to get on with the people's business of reducing that deficit first and foremost, and inclusion of the housing bill in reconciliation can only stall further the desperately needed action to reduce spending. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Latta amendment tomorrow, providing for regular order consideration of the housing bill.

AMERICAN CHILDREN IN POVERTY

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, last evening along with millions of other Americans I watched the evening network news. I was specifically tuned to the ABC Network news that devoted a portion of its program to the issue of poverty among children in America, all ages, all colors, from all geographic locations in this country.

A number of children were interviewed about their desire to have a decent place to live and food to eat. One vignette sticks out in my mind, an interview that I probably will never forget. A young boy when asked how he felt about the poverty stricken conditions within which he lived, his response was, "Sometimes I feel like killing myself."

When I consider that we have an incredible responsibility here to go beyond being auctioneers and budget reducers, but to address the human misery of our people, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a society that destroys its children is a society on its way to dying.

We have a moral and political and ethical responsibility to eradicate poverty in this society.

I challenge this body, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Republican Party to come up with their answer to how we solve poverty in America.

I challenge my party, the Democrats, to come up with an answer as to how we solve poverty in this country. Let us come together on the floor of this House and create some bipartisan effort to eradicate the great tragedy of

poverty among all of us, particularly the children of America.

LEGISLATION TO MANDATE DOGS AT MAJOR AIRPORTS TO SNIFF OUT EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week after the terrorist hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, two terrorists from Iraq were arrested in Italy at the Rome Airport. They were carrying 17 pounds of explosives in the false bottom of a suitcase. They said these explosives were not to be used on Italians, but were for killing Americans and Israelis.

I have been told that with these explosives and a small detonating cap, these men could have gone through a metal detector at most airports with no problem. The metal detector would not pick up plastic explosives or a watch-like detonating cap and they could have blown up an aircraft in flight.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would mandate dogs at major airports to sniff out these explosive devices that cannot be detected by metal detectors.

Mr. Speaker, we are sitting on a time bomb and unless we pass legislation like the bill I am sponsoring, an air terrorist attack will take place.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray all of my colleagues will support this very important piece of legislation.

SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION ON S. 49, RIGHT TO OWN FIREARMS

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I might say that yes, I am going to sign the discharge petition on S. 49, because I am tired of the trampling of the rights of sportsmen.

Yes; I am going to sign the discharge petition, because I am tired of the lockup of any reflective and considered action by the chairman of the committee, who said, "This legislation is dead on arrival."

Yes; I am going to sign the discharge petition as a protest against the dictatorship of committee leadership, which will launch the first hearing in New York City, which already has very strict gun laws and is most willing to prosecute anyone who defends himself.

Yes; I am going to sign the discharge petition, because I support law-abiding citizens who know how to defend themselves. I support sportsmen and I

support law-abiding gun owners and law-abiding gun dealers.

Sign the discharge petition.

SOCIAL IMPERIALISTS WANT US TO ABANDON RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a number of the social imperialists in this body on the House floor today who have told us that they want to abandon one more individual right of the American people, namely, the right to bear arms.

We have moved through a course over the past several years of attempting to take away from law-abiding sportsmen their ability to own firearms. Now we have an opportunity maybe to correct some of the abuses of the past that have been given to us by the Senate in the form of S. 49.

□ 1305

And what did we hear from the House Committee on the Judiciary that has the authority to take up that bill? The chairman of that committee declared that legislation dead on arrival in his committee. We know that when that committee declares something dead on arrival, from past experience, they mean it.

So, therefore, the only way we can help law-abiding sportsmen regain their right to bear arms in a responsible way is to sign the discharge petition and to get that bill out onto the floor for consideration. Otherwise, it is not going to get considered. It is going to be dead on arrival in this House. It is going to be dead on arrival permanently in terms of this Congress. That is wrong. We want consideration of the bill. The way to get consideration of the bill is to sign the discharge petition.

NATIONAL TOPSOIL PRESERVATION ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 463, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 463, as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday and on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 185, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—225

Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Murphy
Akaka	Ford (TN)	Natcher
Andrews	Fowler	Neal
Annuzio	Frank	Nichols
Anthony	Frost	Nowak
Aspin	Fuqua	Oakar
Atkins	Garcia	Oberstar
AuCoin	Gaydos	Obey
Barnard	Gejdenson	Ortiz
Barnes	Gephardt	Owens
Barton	Gibbons	Panetta
Bates	Gingrich	Pease
Bedell	Glickman	Pepper
Bellenson	Gonzalez	Perkins
Bennett	Gray (IL)	Pickle
Berman	Gray (PA)	Price
Bevill	Green	Rahall
Blaggi	Guarini	Rangel
Boggs	Gunderson	Reid
Boland	Hall (OH)	Richardson
Boner (TN)	Hamilton	Rinaldo
Bonior (MI)	Hawkins	Robinson
Bonker	Hayes	Rodino
Borski	Hefner	Roe
Bosco	Hefelt	Rose
Boxer	Hertel	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Horton	Rowland (GA)
Broomfield	Hoyer	Roybal
Brown (CA)	Huckaby	Russo
Bruce	Hutto	Sabo
Bryant	Jacobs	Savage
Burton (CA)	Jenkins	Schneider
Bustamante	Jones (NC)	Schulze
Byron	Jones (TN)	Schumer
Carper	Kanjorski	Seiberling
Carr	Kaptur	Sharp
Chapman	Kastenmeier	Sikorski
Chappell	Kennelly	Siskis
Clay	Kildee	Smith (FL)
Clinger	Kleczka	Smith (IA)
Coelho	Kolter	Smith (NJ)
Coleman (TX)	LaFalce	Solarz
Collins	Lantos	Spence
Conte	Leach (IA)	Spratt
Cooper	Lehman (CA)	St Germain
Coughlin	Lehman (FL)	Staggers
Coyne	Leland	Stark
Crockett	Levin (MI)	Stokes
Darden	Levine (CA)	Stratton
Daschle	Lightfoot	Studds
de la Garza	Lloyd	Swift
Dellums	Long	Tauke
Derrick	Lowry (WA)	Thomas (GA)
Dicks	Luken	Torres
Dingell	Lundine	Torricelli
Dixon	Markey	Towns
Donnelly	Martinez	Trafficant
Dorgan (ND)	Matsui	Traxler
Downey	Mavroules	Udall
Durbin	Mazzoli	Vento
Dwyer	McCain	Visclosky
Dymally	McCloskey	Walgren
Dyson	McCurdy	Waxman
Early	McHugh	Weber
Eckart (OH)	McKinney	Weiss
Edgar	Meyers	Wheat
Edwards (CA)	Mikulski	Whitley
Erdreich	Miller (CA)	Whitten
Evans (IA)	Mineta	Williams
Evans (IL)	Mitchell	Wirth
Fascell	Moakley	Wise
Fazio	Mollohan	Wolpe
Filippo	Moody	Wright
Florio	Morrison (CT)	Yates
Foley	Mrazek	Yatron

NAYS—185

Anderson	Broyhill	Daniel
Applegate	Burton (IN)	Dannemeyer
Archer	Callahan	Daub
Armey	Campbell	Davis
Badham	Carney	DeLay
Bartlett	Chandler	DeWine
Bateman	Chapple	Dickinson
Bentley	Cheney	DioGuardi
Bereuter	Coats	Dornan (CA)
Bilirakis	Cobey	Dreier
Billey	Coble	Duncan
Boehlert	Combest	Eckert (NY)
Boulter	Courter	Edwards (OK)
Breaux	Craig	Emerson
Brown (CO)	Crane	English

Fawell	Lujan	Saxton
Feighan	Lungren	Schaefer
Fiedler	Mack	Schroeder
Fields	MacKay	Schuette
Fish	Marlenee	Sensenbrenner
Frenzel	Martin (IL)	Shaw
Gallo	Martin (NY)	Shumway
Gekas	McCandless	Shuster
Gilman	McCollum	Siljander
Goodling	McDade	Skeen
Gordon	McEwen	Skelton
Gradison	McGrath	Slatery
Gregg	McKernan	Slaughter
Grotberg	McMillan	Smith (NE)
Hall, Ralph	Michel	Smith, Denny
Hammerschmidt	Miller (OH)	(OR)
Hansen	Miller (WA)	Smith, Robert
Hartnett	Molinari	(NH)
Hendon	Monson	Smith, Robert
Henry	Montgomery	(OR)
Hiller	Moore	Snowe
Holt	Moorhead	Snyder
Hopkins	Morrison (WA)	Solomon
Hubbard	Murtha	Stallings
Hughes	Myers	Stangeland
Hunter	Nielson	Stenholm
Hyde	O'Brien	Strang
Ireland	Olin	Stump
Jeffords	Oxley	Sundquist
Johnson	Packard	Sweeney
Jones (OK)	Parris	Swindall
Kasich	Pashayan	Synar
Kemp	Penny	Tauzin
Kindness	Petri	Thomas (CA)
Kolbe	Porter	Valentine
Kostmayer	Pursell	Volkmer
Kramer	Quillen	Vucanovich
Lagomarsino	Ray	Walker
Latta	Regula	Watkins
Leath (TX)	Ridge	Whitehurst
Lent	Ritter	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Wortley
Lewis (FL)	Roemer	Wyden
Lipinski	Rogers	Wylie
Livingston	Roth	Young (AK)
Loeffler	Roukema	Young (FL)
Lott	Rowland (CT)	Zschau
Lowery (CA)	Rudd	

NOT VOTING—24

Addabbo	Hatcher	Shelby
Alexander	Hillis	Tallon
Boucher	Howard	Taylor
Coleman (MO)	Madigan	Vander Jagt
Conyers	Manton	Weaver
Dowdy	Mica	Whittaker
Foglietta	Nelson	Wilson
Franklin	Scheuer	Young (MO)

□ 1315

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MICA for with Mr. FRANKLIN against.

Mrs. HOLT, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. VALENTINE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GUNDERSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DAYLIGHT SAVING EXTENSION ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2095.

□ 1326

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2095) to provide for daylight saving time on an expanded basis, and for other purposes, with Mr. VOLKMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2095, the Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985. I am proud to be co-sponsoring this legislation with my good friend and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power, which I chair, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD]. The bill would move the starting date for daylight saving time to the 1st Sunday in April from its current starting date of the last Sunday in April. The bill would also add a week to daylight saving time to the 1st Sunday of November, so that Halloween will be included in daylight saving time, and trick-or-treating will be a little safer for children.

This is not the first time the House has considered daylight saving time legislation, but I hope this will be the last time. The difference this time is that we have finally worked out a compromise with the former critics of this bill. Previous bills would have started daylight saving time on the 1st Sunday in March. While I personally favored this earlier date, many Members criticized the bill because they contended it would have brought about cold and dark mornings.

So we sat down with many of the Members who had fought against this bill in the past—people such as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE]. We examined sunrise and temperature information and decided that the 1st Sunday in April would be a fair compromise. Sunrises get very early in April. Even after you add an hour for daylight saving time, the sunrise is still early. In fact, sunrises in April, under daylight saving time, would be earlier than sunrises in December, January, and February—the 3 coldest months of the year. The

point is simply this: The bill will not cause dark and cold mornings that would be unsafe or uncomfortable for children, farmers, or others who work in the morning. The mornings will be far brighter and far warmer than any of the preceding winter months. In short, it is a fair compromise.

Having said enough about what the bill won't do—and by that, I mean it will not cause cold or dark mornings—let me describe the bill's benefits.

Talk about daylight saving time often brings a smile, or even a smirk, but the benefits of more daylight are serious and tangible. Indeed, every President has endorsed extending daylight saving time into March and April since a test of extended daylight saving time occurred in 1974 and 1975.

Daylight saving time is an energy saver. According to a Department of Transportation study, daylight saving time could save 100,000 barrels per day of oil equivalent during March and April.

Daylight saving time is a crime stopper. Studies of crime statistics in the District of Columbia showed that violent crimes were down by more than 10 percent in March and April during the 1974-75 daylight saving experiment compared to years under standard time.

Daylight saving time saves lives. A Department of Transportation study of the daylight saving time experiment showed a 0.7-percent reduction in traffic fatalities due to daylight saving time in March and April. This translates into saving 22 lives in April and preventing 1,600 injuries. The extension of daylight saving time to cover Halloween is endorsed by the National Safety Council as a child safety measure.

Daylight saving time is popular. In a poll conducted earlier this year by the Chamber of Commerce magazine, Nation's Business, readers were asked if they would prefer that daylight saving time begin on the 3d Sunday in March. The readers preferred extending daylight saving time by a 68.9-percent to 29.5-percent margin.

Daylight saving time is the blessing of sight for the over 400,000 Americans suffering from retinitis pigmentosa, known as night blindness. In moving testimony before our subcommittee, a young adult, who suffers from night blindness, described the hardship of living in a world that closes in mid-afternoon when the Sun sets. The extra hour of sight that daylight saving time would bring is just enough time to do the shopping or drive home from school or the office.

Daylight saving time helps business. This year a coalition of businesses with over \$135 billion in annual sales has joined the battle for expanded daylight saving time. The businesses include convenience stores, like 7-

Eleven, sporting goods manufacturers, the barbecue industry, the Foodservice and Lodging Institute with members like McDonald's, the nurserymen's industry, and others. This coalition, which reads like a Who's Who of summertime fun, has performed studies which show that sales could increase by up to 10 percent with more daylight saving time—that's \$13 billion a year, and that's jobs across America.

So let me review the facts for everyone. Here is a simple bill, with no costs to the Treasury, that will save energy, reduce crime, save lives on the highway, provide sight to the handicapped, bring a boost to hundreds of thousands of small businessmen, and is supported by the public by over 2 to 1. On top of that we have developed a compromise with the bill's former opponents to avoid any of the claimed hardships of the past bills.

And one final thing—we have added an extra week at the end of daylight saving time to the 1st Sunday in November—a Halloween treat for children that has been endorsed by the National Safety Council and local PTA groups across the country as a boost for child safety.

So I urge my colleagues to cast their vote for this bill and once and for all settle this matter by bringing a little sunshine to everyone's life.

□ 1330

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, as the first Member of the House to introduce legislation extending daylight saving time this year, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2095, and want to thank my good friends, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MOORHEAD, for bringing this bill to the floor today. I worked closely with Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MOORHEAD on my bill—even testified before their subcommittee on it—and appreciated their speedy consideration of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, this bill—of which I am an original sponsor—would begin daylight saving time—or, d.s.t.—on the first Sunday in April and end it on the first Sunday in November. Under present law, d.s.t. begins on the last Sunday in April and ends on the last Sunday in October. H.R. 2095, then, is a 5-week extension, and one that I strongly support.

The best thing about extension of d.s.t. is that it is an easy, painless, and inexpensive way to save oil, reduce crime, and reduce traffic fatalities. In addition, by extending d.s.t. 1 week into November, we will insure that children are not "trick or treating" in the dark on Halloween.

Back in 1974, when the Nation was on year-round d.s.t., the Department

of Transportation estimated that the United States saved 500,000 barrels of oil per day during d.s.t. In the cities studied, violent crime was 13 percent lower. There were 200 fewer traffic fatalities. Individuals with some visual impairments had an extra hour of daylight.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2095 is a compromise. My bill, H.R. 1935, extended d.s.t. for 9 weeks—but to accommodate those Members who represent western parts of time zones, the committee agreed to go with a 5-week extension. This is a compromise which I endorse wholeheartedly.

This bill—and let me stress this—will not cause later sunrises than we have now in the fall. There may be attempts today to argue that beginning d.s.t. in early April will cause children to walk to school in the dark. That is a misleading argument. If H.R. 2095 were enacted, sunrises in early April would be earlier—earlier—than in September, when we already have daylight saving time.

So, that is a poor argument. I went over to the Library of Congress and looked at the sunrises in some cities and compared them. In Philadelphia, sunrise would be at 6:38 a.m. in April if our bill were enacted—18 minutes earlier than sunrise on September 30 under current law. In Omaha, sunrise is 23 minutes earlier in April—12 minutes in Los Angeles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to close by giving a message to the other body: I urge them to pass this bill quickly. In every Congress for 6 years, my good friend, the former Senator Paul Tsongas, introduced this bill. Once, the other body even passed it, and I would like to urge them to repeat their past heroic performance by presenting a dramatic reading to the Senate:

"Let there be light," saith we to thee.
"Passeth this bill and extend D.S.T."
Yea, though thee driveth home in the
April of Darkness
Thee should have no fear
For the House always acteth responsibly.
Sendeth H.R. 2095 to the White House
For when thee walketh beside green pastures
in April,
It shall be in the light."

Support this bill. Let there be light.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE].

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to extend daylight saving time is a perennial issue and one that I have actively fought since early 1983. At that time I sent a report about the possible extension of daylight saving time to the 140 weekly newspapers in South Dakota. The response was overwhelming. For months my office received a barrage of cards, letters, and calls from schoolchildren, farm wives, grandparents and everyone in between.

This has always been an issue of deep concern to the citizens of South Dakota. Many of them expressed a genuine fear of

the negative effects an extension would have on young schoolchildren and farmers.

Every time I am home in the late winter months and have to be at an early morning breakfast, I realize how important the extra hour of daylight in the morning is to the safety of young schoolchildren walking to school or waiting along unlit country roads for schoolbuses. Driving along those roads before the Sun has risen would make both rural and urban Members realize the importance of sunlight where street lights cannot be installed.

If daylight saving time was extended, these small children would be forced to walk to school or wait for buses in the bitter cold mornings before the Sun is even up. Although it has often been debated, common sense tells us that this extension would jeopardize their safety as they trek along the icy country roads.

Another group of individuals adversely affected by an alteration in daylight saving time includes our Nation's farmers. In the face of the worst economic conditions since the depression, many farmers are forced to hold down second jobs in town for their continued survival. If they were deprived of an extra hour of daylight in the morning, the completion of chores would either have to be done in darkness or squeezed into an hour's less time. For those men and women producing our food supply, this isn't fair.

Time and time again, I hear many South Dakotans ask why we don't just get rid of daylight saving time altogether. But for the most part, most of the citizens of my State are willing to accept a fair split of 6 months on, 6 months off.

It's fair for both sides and should be kept that way.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, I think we have to look at the bill from a national perspective, and I think there are real national benefits.

The committee has cited studies on energy conservation, traffic safety and crime reduction that all support more daylight saving time. I don't know whether the studies are 100 percent valid, but even if they were only half-true, it would be reason enough to support this bill.

For example, one study found that crimes were reduced by 10 percent in Washington, DC, when we had daylight saving time in April. Suppose it were only 5 percent. Wouldn't it still be worth it?

Another study showed traffic accidents were down by about 1 percent during extended daylight saving time. Suppose it were one-half percent. Wouldn't it still be worth it?

I think it makes good sense, and I support the bill.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Daylight Savings Time Extension Act of 1985.

This is now the third time that supporters of this seriously flawed legislation have tried to get it passed by Congress. They failed in 1981. They failed again in 1983. And I'm sure they'll fail again this year. Because no matter how much they tinker with it, the fact remains that there are very serious problems with this legislation.

First, as has been stressed repeatedly, there is the hardship it would cause for our farmers. Many of them would like to see daylight savings time cut back; the last thing many of them want is an extension.

While you city dwellers are sleeping away the early morning hours, these farmers are up doing the chores which will eventually supply the food for your breakfast table. And if you cut back on their morning daylight, you'll be forcing many of them to do their chores in the cold dark. This is a particular problem on farms where a family member goes to work in a factory.

Second, there are serious concerns about our children's safety. Even under this compromise bill, our children will be forced to walk to the school bus in the dark. And in the country, this means they'll be walking right in the street, since we don't have sidewalks. As any parent knows, this is dangerous.

As the 1976 National Bureau of Standards report on the daylight savings time experiment concluded, "There was a statistically significant increase of school-age fatalities in the morning during the 4-month period, January to April 1974, as compared to the same period of nondaylight savings time in 1973."

While most of these increased fatalities occurred during January and February, and not during April, as is at issue in the bill before us today—the fact is clear. Darkness in the early morning hours increases risks for our schoolchildren.

Mr. Chairman, we spend hours debating child welfare in Congress. We discuss child restraints in cars. And we spare no effort when it comes to child nutrition. But when it comes to deciding between that extra hour of daylight for golf, or tennis, or jogging, and our rural children's safety, we can't quite decide which is more important. Mr. Chairman, this bill offers scant benefits for so seriously jeopardizing our children.

Because let us be frank, while the authors of this bill stress potential energy savings, that will not be a major benefit of this legislation. The Bureau of Standards concluded about the 1974-75 experiment in year-round daylight savings that "the available data do not lead to any conclusions as to the possible energy savings * * *."

As the hearing record indicates, the supporters of this legislation are interested in more daylight for urban recreation.

Mr. Chairman, if this body is determined to pass some kind of Urban Improvement Act of 1985, there are less costly ways to do it. We could put in lighting on our softball fields. But to ask our farmers and our children across the country to pay the cost in disrupted lives is unwise. I urge the defeat of this legislation.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, daylight saving time usually brings a smile to most Members' faces, particularly with all the very pressing issues that we all agree need to be addressed this session.

But, amusement aside, there are few other bills that come before us where we can improve the welfare of so many people so easily.

Extending daylight saving time for a reasonable period will save millions of dollars in energy costs, reduce traffic fatalities, provide greater safety for children on Halloween, improve the mobility for Americans suffering from night blindness, and promote over \$1 billion in economic growth every year. And, amazingly, all this can be done without additional taxpayer expense or more Government regulation.

I understand that there are some Members who have problems with extending daylight saving time. I think the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Energy Conservation and Power Subcommittee have done an excellent job in crafting a compromise that accommodates those concerns and preserves the benefits to be achieved by extending daylight saving time. I support the compromise and this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 2095 without amendments.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the bill and congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power and the ranking minority member for having worked on a carefully considered bipartisan compromise which includes former opponents of this concept.

I think there are just three important points which need to be made. First, with regard to our population and convenience and the convenience that they enjoy on a daily basis in their ability to shop, do their chores, and do the things that people do in their leisure time, it is very clear that this bill is a great benefit to them.

Second, with regard to the energy conservation, the point was just made

by the previous speaker, in April alone we will save 100,000 barrels a day in oil equivalent with regard to energy, about 3 million barrels, based on the passage of one piece of legislation.

Third, with regard to schoolchildren, an admirable concern, but the facts are irrefutable, and I think they are going to be presented to us a little later in the debate, but the fact is, it is going to be light in the morning during the month of April when these children are getting on the schoolbuses, it will not be dark. It is important to keep that in mind.

Once again, I congratulate the chairman and the ranking minority member for working out a carefully considered compromise bill that now includes many of the former opponents of this legislation, and I urge the Members to vote for it.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2095, the Daylight Saving Extension of 1985. Actually, if we are to apply a truth-in-labeling tag on this legislation, not to mention a little common sense, it should be called precisely what it is—the "Revised Urban Convenience Act of 1985."

Now, I know this bill is not a repeat of the 1974 year-round daylight saving time experiment under which most of us from rural and western areas floundered around in darkness in the morning and learned the true meaning of living in the land of the "Midnight Sun." Thank goodness for that. I know too, that this bill is not the bill we defeated 2 years ago that would have extended daylight saving time to 8 months and 1 week. This is being billed as a reasonable compromise and provides for only 1 month's extension. It is apparently being offered up under that old expression that if a lot will not do a lot of good, then maybe a little will do some good.

Mr. Chairman, the objections I raised 2 years ago are still valid. School children, despite what my colleagues say, will have to get up, meet the school bus or walk to school in the dark for a longer period than necessary—at least in April. Now, I know the sunrise under daylight saving time in April is earlier than it is in winter months. The logic of that apparently is—why do I have to get up or open my place of business or farm in the dark? Because it was dark in the winter and you got used to it, that's why.

Mr. Chairman, what this bill really boils down to is that rural citizens will be put to some disadvantage in order that urban citizens can enjoy an extra hour of light in the evening. That is it. Oh, I know that my colleagues will say otherwise—they have been saying that in every Congress since this business became an issue. Allegedly this bill is

going to save 100,000 barrels of oil a day, reduce traffic fatalities, increase our economy some \$4 billion and reduce violent crime. The only thing it will not do is stop tooth decay or guarantee the Boston Red Sox a pennant.

Come on now—in previous debates, we have shown that energy studies do not take into account the extra energy costs involved in that additional hour of darkness throughout farm country, what happens on the road wherever you drive in darkness in the morning or the costs to small businesses in terms of economic loss. Now this bill may—just may reduce violent crime. I guess muggers and such are not early risers in Boston and New York. But you know where that study really came from? Right here in the District of Columbia, and I submit this town has special problems in that regard.

I might add my hometown is Dodge City and despite our past reputation, violent crime is not a problem that I feel will be addressed by 1 more hour of daylight on Front Street.

The advantages of an extension espoused by the bill's sponsors simply do not hold in rural America. There will be no energy savings, no increase in safety or commercial activity, and no decrease in crime rates. Instead, there will be increased inconvenience.

But I suspect the letters I receive will not even repeat the arguments I have summarized here today. I suspect they will instead ask, what on Earth are we doing fiddling around with the time of the day via the legislative process when we have far more serious matters before us? I call to the attention of my colleagues the advice I received the last time you folks were about the business of legislating time. One nice lady suggested that as long as we were going to change the time, why not increase the temperature 10 to 20 degrees in the winter and, of course, do the same thing to cool things down in the summer.

Mr. Chairman, I simply ask that this body not make a bad situation worse for rural America. If it was wrong to make a wholesale change in daylight saving time, it doesn't make much sense to fiddle around with it just a little bit. I don't know what it is that my colleagues want to do during that extra hour of daylight during the month of April but my suggestion is that it would be a lot easier on us in farm country if you would just get up an hour earlier. Let's defeat this bill and get on to serious business.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT].

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California giving me this time.

Tongue-in-cheek, we talked about this bill a year or so ago, but I really

think there are some significant points that ought to be made. One is, I got up this morning to leave Charleston, SC, kind of early; it was extremely dark in my home because of daylight savings time, and I had to cut on all of my lights, thereby burning more energy.

If it is going to be longer daylight savings, then people are going to have to drive to their favorite recreations, thereby burning some of those hundreds of thousands of gallons' worth of oil that we are going to save in the way of additional fuel expended in our automobiles.

I think the biggest concern that Congress should have is for our agricultural community.

Last week or so, we passed a farm bill spending billions and billions of the taxpayers' dollars to aid the farmer, to aid our agricultural community, and here today we are preparing to extend daylight saving time even further, which to my way of thinking is not going to help the agricultural community, the farmer who has been said by many before me is working long before many of us even turn over and drink our first glass of orange juice.

You know, we have a history in this country of the farmers rising to do their daily chores by the old crow of the rooster; you know, the rooster gets up and crows and gets the old farmer and his family going, to get the agricultural part of our society moving, which feeds America and feeds the world.

The question I want to ask you gentlemen, tongue-in-cheek, is: If you pass this legislation, who is going to wake up the rooster that is going to wake up the farmer to tell him it is time to get up and toil in his field?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTNETT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make an observation, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is really a man of exceptionally high caliber, because I know he likes to play golf. To take the position he has in view of the fact that he likes to play golf, I think, is exemplary.

Mr. HARTNETT. I reclaim my time to say this to my colleague. When I play golf, I do not play often, but I get in a lot more golf than the gentleman does. I hit the ball about 130 times, where you only hit it about 60 or 70. So I get more golf in with each round than you do.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I do not have much time at this time, but later on in the amending process I will have some time.

You can write "Dear Colleagues" that are cute and wise and smart as you want to write them, as cleverly as you want to write them, indicating when the Sun rises or when the Sun sets in somebody else's district. But unless you have been there, unless you have had the responsibility of putting those youngsters along highways in rural and semirural areas, you just do not understand the situation.

I thought perhaps that since I had been away from the superintendency for 11 years, perhaps I do not remember just how the situation was.

So I used Friday morning, Saturday morning, Sunday morning, and Monday morning to drive those bus routes at 6:30 to 7:30 in the morning when all those children are out there, the secondary children particularly.

Let me tell you, at 6:30 in the morning it is as dark as dark can possibly be; at 7 o'clock it is also the same way. It is beginning to break by 7:15. We also have at this particular time of the year and early in April the time when fog rolls into our area. We have the same time, when the greatest nightmare that a superintendent has takes place, that is, lying awake at night determining what is going to happen to that temperature at daylight. Is it just going to drop enough so that, as a matter of fact, those slippery roads are not only wet but, as a matter of fact, they are covered with ice? Let me tell you, unless you have been there, unless you have been to a funeral of someone who was killed because of the transportation you were responsible for, you do not really understand what it is you are doing at this particular time. And I think you had better forget the almanacs, and you had better forget the so-called statistics, and you had better forget about when the Sun rises and Sun sets and actually find out just exactly what is happening with children along highways with no sidewalks in early April, in November, in late October. It is a serious problem, one we should not be playing with. We should be doing things that are in the best interests of this country.

I, too, could play golf in the evening; I, too, could mow the lawn. That is what we are really talking about. Let us stop this nonsense about saying we are talking about energy and talking about saving lives; we are talking about adult convenience. Adult Convenience Act might be a good title for this bill.

Think seriously about the young people whose lives you are truly jeopardizing, from someone who has been there and truly knows.

□ 1355

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I respect his sense that you have to go to Pennsylvania or to his district in order to understand this issue.

So what I tried to do was just do a little research on the issue of how school transportation, how this issue would be handled in the gentleman's district, but using that as a microcosm for the whole country so that we can understand what our bill does and why it is not the radical bill that endangers children that the gentleman would have people on this floor believe it to be.

Let us go to York, PA, and use York, PA, as an example of how this bill affects children in this country.

The gentleman mentioned that 11 years ago he was in fact the superintendent of schools. Well, 11 years ago was the energy crisis. And in 1974 we passed a law in this country that had daylight saving time go around the year, December, January, February, November, March. In fact, that was a terrible mistake. It was wrong to have daylight saving time in January. It was wrong to have it in December. And the gentleman is right, some of the sunrises during that time were 8 o'clock in the morning, quarter of 8 in the morning, quarter past 8 in the morning. We are not advocating that. That would be wrong. We are advocating that we go all the way back to the month of April, April 1.

There is an interesting thing about April 1 if you pick that as a date upon which you want to begin daylight saving time. April 1 will have under daylight saving time a sunrise that begins at 6:48 in the morning at York, PA. Do you know the nearest date to that on the calendar for the school year of children in York, PA? September 16, 6:49 in the morning, daylight begins.

Now, if you want to tell me that on September 16 in your district, with daylight beginning at 6:49, you have got a problem in your district, then you should do something about it, because there are 22 weeks in your school year that are more dangerous than April 1 that begins at 6:48. December 31 in your district is 7:28. December 16 it is at 7:22.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I would be very happy to do something about it. I would love to have the gentleman introduce legislation where it might be safe to have daylight saving time, and that would be from Memorial Day to Labor Day. And then you would be doing something worthwhile for this country and particularly for schoolchildren.

Mr. MARKEY. The question that we are facing here is whether or not

the children in your district are unsafe right now. If the children in your district are unsafe right now, then you ought to change the time that school starts. You ought to say right now that for 22 weeks, up to April 1, that the schoolday starts at a dangerous time, and you ought to tell the people in your district, you ought to tell the police, the parents, and the teachers, because if that is the condition, then you have a crisis in your district.

But I am trying to tell you right now that as of April 1 there were 161 days that those kids were getting up that were more dangerous than April 1. We are not picking the middle of the winter here. We are picking the end of the winter. We are picking a date that is the equivalent of September 16, 1 week after Labor Day, in your district. We have no intention of endangering the children in your district or any other district in this country. This is a compromise. It has been worked out very carefully, with no intention of making anyone have to suffer late mornings when children are out in the dark standing on the sidewalk.

Those are the facts. It is not anything that is any more or less than just the facts. We do not have to go to York, PA; you do not have to come to Boston, MA; we do not have to go to the gentleman's district in Utah. We just have to know what time the Sun rises all across the country.

On April 8, 6:36 in the morning the Sun comes up; on April 15, 6:26 in the morning; on April 22, 6:16 in the morning. By April 29, it is 6:06 in the morning when the Sun is rising. It is almost the end of the year, the school year. The real danger for these kids is in the heart of the winter: November, December, January, February, March. Those are the days when if there is a problem in your district something should be done right now. Those kids should not be allowed to be out on the street.

My contention is this: In fact, there is a process in place in your district, in my district, and in every other district throughout this country, to ensure the school safety of kids in the morning. That is why there is no crisis. But in the late evening, and right around supertime, kids are out all by themselves, they are wandering around the streets. They do not have traffic guides, they do not have policemen, they do not have school buses—in the dusk, when drivers are coming home drunk. They are not drunk at 7 o'clock in the morning. They are drunk coming home from work. That is when the danger is to these children. We are trying to give them the sunshine at a time when they need it. But we are not making them get up at an unusually or unreasonably dangerous hour; 6:48 in the morning is the same as September 16 in York, PA, and the same

equivalent situation exists in every single district across this country.

I just hope that the gentleman can understand that I believe that he is looking back through, in a rear-view mirror, to 1974, when he might have been school superintendent. But, remember, during 1974 we had year-round daylight saving time, and that was a mistake. It is wrong, and I recognize it, and all of the proponents recognize it. We are giving you back those 5 dangerous months, November, December, January, February, March, but we are saying, however, that once you reach April, you are in the equivalent situation as you are in September, and we can in fact say, with all confidence, that the children of this country are safe, whether they be in York, PA, in my district, or any part of the country. There is no intention to make this the adult entertainment act of 1985. It, rather is something that gives the proper distribution of sunshine so that not only adults but children can enjoy it after school and in the early evening hours, as every other person in this country has the right to enjoy it.

Those are the facts. It is no more, no less than that. Any other construction of what this bill is is merely an attempt to raise up issues that were probably raised in 1974 against another bill, or perhaps even against the bill that was brought up to this floor 2 years ago, but does not properly reflect the compromise which has been worked out between myself and other Members on the majority side with the gentleman from Utah, the gentleman from Indiana, and others, who opposed the bill in 1983, as an attempt to in fact come to some kind of reconciliation, some kind of splitting of the differences that recognized the facts of when the Sun does rise in this country.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. In certain areas of the country where they would not fit into the whole situation of daylight saving, they should make some changes locally. I think it is quite obvious that the majority of the country, certainly my area in Florida, would greatly benefit from the gentleman's bill, and I compliment him for his statement.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and ranking minority member of the

Energy Conservation and Power Subcommittee for drafting a compromise that achieves most of the benefits to be achieved from extending daylight saving time—yet is sensitive to the concerns of those areas of the country where the weather is still harsh and unpredictable in March.

My personal preference is for daylight saving time to run from Memorial Day to Labor Day. I recognize, however, that this is not feasible and that there are Members who would like daylight saving time to run almost year round. The compromise today, as all compromises, does not satisfy everyone. But I can live with daylight saving time for the month of April, and I intend to support this compromise.

In committee I offered the same amendment that my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING, may be offering today. I understand his concerns, and I share them.

The legislation before us today is very different from the legislation that we considered last Congress. Last Congress, the legislation would have started daylight saving time on the 1st Sunday of March, and would have extended daylight saving time to 8 months. This was unacceptable, and unnecessary. For many areas of the country, daylight saving time for the month of March would create unsafe conditions for schoolchildren, and difficulties for farmers performing early morning chores. I also believed that it was unnecessary—for almost all of the benefits to be achieved by extending daylight saving time would accrue in April and not March.

The legislation before us today accommodates these concerns. H.R. 2095, as originally introduced, would have started daylight saving time in mid-March. In committee, I offered the amendment so that daylight saving time would start at the beginning of April.

With this change I can support H.R. 2095. Sunrise on the first Sunday in April under daylight saving time will be earlier than any sunrises from November through February under standard time. Morning in April, even with daylight saving time, would be brighter and warmer than in any other winter month. Yet, most of the benefits to result from extending daylight saving time will still be achieved, even though the extension will be limited to April.

The legislation is strongly supported by the administration and by a broad coalition of businesses. The daylight saving time coalition representing 8,300 companies, estimates that the potential economic growth from this bill could be over \$1 billion annually. These economic benefits, together with fuel savings, enhanced safety for automobile drivers, and reduced crime—are compelling reasons for ex-

tending daylight savings for a reasonable time. The extension provided for in this legislation is reasonable and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2095.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is somewhat unusual in that it would provide many benefits to the American public with no increase in Government bureaucracy and no additional expenditures by the Federal Government. I have reviewed this matter and the extension of daylight saving time will not only promote energy conservation but will provide a great boon to our Nation's economy.

By extending daylight saving time, the opportunities for tourism and prime time shopping will increase and could result in an increase of up to \$1 billion in economic growth every year.

But perhaps the most persuasive argument for the bill is that it will enhance safety. It will reduce traffic fatalities, reduce violent crime, and provide more daylight for children trick or treating on Halloween. Further, it will provide greater mobility for the almost half a million Americans suffering from night blindness.

One of the important compromises made by our committee was changing the starting date for daylight saving time from the third Sunday in March to the first Sunday in April. This will greatly benefit those parts of the country, like my home State of Colorado, where winter is harsh and unpredictable in the early spring. With the compromises made in our committee, there seems to be no question that this bill should be supported overwhelmingly by the House.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Massachusetts, Ed MARKEY, chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on energy conservation and power, in urging you to enact H.R. 2095, the "Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985." This is a fair, balanced and truly bipartisan bill.

Section 3 of the bill amends the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by advancing the starting date for daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the first Sunday of April. It also extends the closing date from the last Sunday in October to the first Sunday in November.

Section 4 provides for the continuation of State exemptions and partial exemptions for States in more than one time zone.

Section 4 provides the Federal Communications Commission with the authority to grant variances with respect to the hours of operation of daytime AM radio stations and their operating

power levels. This section carefully protects State exemptions and directs the FCC to take necessary steps to protect daytime AM radio stations affected by the sunrise. I expect the FCC to fully exercise its authority under section 4 to ensure the smoothest possible operation of daylight AM radio stations.

Mr. Chairman, I have for several years introduced and supported legislation that expands daylight saving time. There are excellent reasons for such an extension.

By conserving daylight hours, we will achieve electricity savings that are the equivalent of 100,000 barrels of oil for each day daylight saving time is extended. I find this energy conservation measure particularly appealing because—unlike other energy measures—this bill requires no new Government bureaucracies, no intensive and burdensome apparatus, and little, if any, expenditures of taxpayers' funds.

Further, the benefits from this legislation will transcend energy conservation. The probable benefits are likely to include: as many as 200 fewer traffic fatalities per year; a reduction in violent crime; increased daylight time, tourism, and prime-time shopping; economic growth that could amount to over \$1 billion per year; and, as has been emphasized by the retinitis pigmentosa foundation, extra evening sunlight and mobility for the over 400,000 Americans suffering from night blindness.

□ 1410

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts on the well thought out plan that we have before us. I think it is entirely possible that a 12-month daylight savings plan could pass. I think it is in recognition of the changing makeup of society.

What the gentleman has done in this plan is provided the needed flexibility for those areas that feel they need, at some portion of the year, to have a regular time. I just want to commend the gentleman for the time and effort that he has put in on this project.

It is eminently reasonable and appealing to those of us who represent both rural and suburban areas because we feel the tug within our districts, and what you have provided for here is an opportunity to, in discussing it with those people, show how at the local option basis, and even at the State option if necessary, that everyone is provided for.

What we have here, is that although there may be individuals who feel that they must rise in opposition to this plan, this plan, when looked at in terms of benefiting the greatest number with flexibility for those who feel that they need to be different, is a plan that I think the House will pass overwhelmingly.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts and the subcommittee for offering us something that is rational and reasonable.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have carefully looked into the matter of children waiting for school buses in the morning under an expanded daylight saving period. Studies conducted by the Department of Transportation and National Safety Council indicate that school age children are not subject to greater involvement in accidents. Since the amount of daylight hours in March or April are essentially the same as the daylight hours during September and October, there is no reason to believe that the extension of daylight saving time under this legislation, as originally introduced, would have any adverse consequences.

While I continue to believe that H.R. 2095, as introduced, would have been favored by a large majority of the House, it was clear that some Members continued to have concerns about extending daylight saving time into the month of March when, in some regions of the country, the weather is still harsh and unpredictable.

To accommodate the concerns and to build a broad consensus in support of this legislation, H.R. 2095 was amended so that daylight saving time would start the first Sunday in April rather than the third Sunday in March. This reflects an excellent compromise. Sunrise on the first Sunday in April with daylight saving time would be earlier than sunrises throughout the entire winter under standard time. Morning conditions in April, even with daylight saving time, would be both brighter and warmer than in any winter month.

As amended, H.R. 2095 would increase daylight saving time to a little over 7 months. All of the benefits outlined above would be achieved and the interests of the regions most concerned with such an extension are addressed.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence clearly shows that the American public is behind an expansion of daylight saving time. The extension of daylight saving will help our Nation to save energy at no cost to the taxpayer. The administration strongly supports this bill. I urge my colleagues to join with Chairman MARKEY and myself, and act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the 4-week extension of daylight saving time provided for in H.R. 2095. This proposal has had widespread support for several years. I believe the action taken by the Energy and Commerce Committee to begin daylight saving time on the first weekend in April should convince even those who are wavering on this issue to support this reasonable extension.

I believe the issues of energy conservation, fewer traffic accidents, more daylight hours for recreation, a reduction in violent crime, and help to those who suffer from night blindness are all good reasons to support this bill. As the Los Angeles Times noted in an editorial on September 2, the potential nationwide benefits of 30 or more hours of evening daylight far outweigh the potential disadvantages of 30 or more hours of morning darkness. I have had positive response to this idea from my constituents and I hope that this time around we can all support this worthy idea.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 2095, the Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985. In particular, I oppose the plan to start daylight saving earlier in the year than under the present system.

Beginning daylight saving time on the first Sunday of April instead of the last Sunday in April simply means that more farmers will have to do morning chores in dark, cold weather. It means that more rural school children will have to walk to bus stops in the dark during a month in which snow storms and blizzards are not uncommon in North Dakota.

As a result, we put school kids at greater risk to traffic accidents and make work more difficult in the Farm Belt. Farmers and rural people understand sacrifice and would probably accept these hindrances if change really produced all the benefits claimed by the proponents of expanded daylight saving.

But the facts don't support the latter case. The definitive 1976 National Bureau of Standards study on the matter threw cold water on the notion that expanding daylight saving would save energy, would not endanger schoolchildren, and would not adversely affect some regions more than others. The study simply could not confirm alleged benefits and did show that certain rural areas—especially in the western parts of time zones where 65 percent of the population resides—would face much later sunrises than under the current system.

In basic terms, supporters of this bill uphold the benefits for some regions of the Nation at the expense of hardships for other areas—especially farming and rural communities in the Northern States. They overlook the fact that the last freeze in most North Dakota towns occurs in mid-May. When you add darkness to cold and severe weather, you make a prescription for traffic dangers and work hardships.

In conclusion, I understand the desire of some to expand daylight saving time in the interest of reduced energy usage and greater convenience for urban areas. I only wish these goals could be reached without hurting the farmers and rural communities in my State. Consequently, I oppose the revision of daylight saving and express my support for continuing the current plan.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2095

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1 SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Daylight Saving Extension Act of 1985".

SEC. 2 CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds—

(1) that various studies of governmental and non-governmental agencies indicate that daylight saving time over an expanded period would produce a significant energy savings in electrical power consumption;

(2) that daylight saving time may yield energy savings in other areas besides electrical power consumption;

(3) that daylight saving time over an expanded period could serve as an incentive for further energy conservation by individuals, companies, and the various governmental entities at all levels of government, and that such energy conservation efforts could lead to greatly expanded energy savings; and

(4) that the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for the children and youth of our Nation, greater utilization of parks and recreation areas, expanded economic opportunity through extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community.

SEC. 3. DAYLIGHT SAVING EXTENDED TO START IN MARCH AND END IN NOVEMBER.

Section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "last Sunday of April" and inserting in lieu thereof "third Sunday of March"; and

(2) by striking out "last Sunday of October" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of November".

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON EXISTING STATE ELECTIONS.

Any law in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by a State with parts thereof in more than one time zone, or

(2) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of such Act by a State that lies entirely within one time zone, shall be held and considered to remain in effect as the exercise by that State of the exemption permitted by such Act unless that State, by law, provides that such exemption shall not apply.

SEC. 5. ADJUSTMENT OF OPERATING HOURS OF DAYTIME BROADCASTERS.

(a) **ADJUSTMENT OF OPERATING PERIOD.**—Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, with respect to hours of operation of daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service.

(b) **VARIANCE FOR POWER AND OTHER OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS.**—Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics.

(c) **SUBSEQUENT CHANGES.**—Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that if such effective date occurs in any calendar year after March 1, this Act shall take effect on the first day of the following calendar year.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, strike out section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. DAYLIGHT SAVING EXTENDED.

Section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "last Sunday of April" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of April"; and

(2) by striking out "last Sunday of October" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of November".

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, this is a compromise amendment. It has already been described in general debate on the floor. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah moved the starting date for daylight saving time to the first Sunday in April from the proposed date of the third Sunday in March. The amendment is a fair compromise. I support it.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the committee amendment. Naturally, we would rather have a longer period of time for daylight savings, but there were some legitimate objections that were raised by people in some of the northern regions and some of the farm areas. To meet those objections we reduced the period so that daylight saving time would start the first Sunday in April.

I think that their objections have been taken care of. There are still, of course, a few people who object to the bill, but the vast majority of people in this House and throughout the country support daylight saving time during this extended period. The objections of the few have been taken care of.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we just saw an interesting exhibit down here. I am not quite sure what it was set out to prove. I believe it was set out to prove that as a matter of fact there is more light in early April in the morning than there is in September and October. Well, I do not propose to argue against that.

I am asking, should we do something to make things more wrong than they presently are or should we be going the other way? Of course it is darker in the morning in October. It is wrong for daylight saving in October when you think in terms of child abuse, and that is what we ought to call it.

I found it humorous that someone was discussing what local districts should do in relationship to taking care of these problems in October and April, et cetera. That is very humorous. It is very obvious that no one knows very much about how you get 5,000 or 10,000 students on buses and haul them for a half hour, 40 minutes, 45 minutes, an hour, in many rural districts, and, at the same time, meet the State standards in relationship to the number of hours that students must be in school.

It is not an easy thing, but I am here to tell you that I only lost one child during my tenure as a superintendent of schools because of transportation. But it is something I will never forget. I have asked myself over and over, many times: What could I have done differently, as a matter of fact, to make sure that that child was not lost.

Keep in mind that the very time you are talking about, as I mentioned before, is a time when we have the fog periods in the Northeast, in the Midwest, and part of the South.

□ 1420

It is also the time when as a matter of fact we have a temperature problem. Of course we had serious difficulties in November, December, January, and February. Not very many superintendents in that area, in the Northeast, the Midwest, and parts of the South do very much sleeping during those months, but at least at that time you pretty well know that you are going to have to delay school the next morning or you are going to have to cancel school that day in order to protect those lives.

I hear colleagues of mine around here smile and laugh whenever they

hear somebody say, "Oh, gee, they closed the school again," or they delayed it another hour or two. You would not smile or laugh if you had to make those decisions. Those are very difficult decisions to make. They are not your children. Although I must admit that one time I was called as a superintendent to the emergency room, and it was my child also. Fortunately none of those children in a bus accident were permanently injured.

Let us keep in mind those children. You are putting them along a highway at a time when you have all of the traffic going to work. You are putting them along a highway because there are no sidewalks. You are putting them on a bus where in many instances the driver is not a totally experienced bus driver. You are putting them in a bus driver's charge who not only has the responsibility to somehow or other get those buses down trails that were built for horse and buggy, but at the same time be the disciplinarian on that bus, and that is pretty difficult to do and still concentrate on what you are doing.

I do not doubt that it is not a good idea to have daylight saving time in October and in late September. I know it is the wrong time. But by doing what we are doing today we are not correcting that ill, we are just adding to it, because we are adding another week in November, we are adding 3 more weeks in April, 4 more weeks of critical time.

And so I would hope that my colleagues would think strictly not about how convenient it may be. Do not fall too hard for what the savings are, but think primarily in terms of what will happen if we continue expanding the time that we are going to expose these youngsters. We do not want to expose them now, but we do not have a choice. Let us not make something that is already wrong even worse. Let us try to work the other way and see whether we cannot correct the wrongs that are there now.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee dealt with the issues raised by the gentleman who has just spoken so well. I would like to yield to the subcommittee chairman so that he may again go over the information because it seems clear that the gentleman who was in the well was absolutely sincere in his concerns, but the concerns do not relate very effectively to the specific times that the Sun rises in his district and across the country. The chairman of the subcommittee made that point, I think, very clear, and I think it would be extremely useful—if the chairman would not mind—if he would make that point again.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I would like to move down to the well to once again make that point.

Our concern, Mr. Chairman, is that in fact the time for starting schools is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the school committees, the school departments, the school superintendents, the parents, and the citizens of the various counties and cities and towns across this country.

If there is a problem and it exists in the gentleman's district, I want to make this point once again very, very clear. The problem exists for 22 out of the 40 weeks of the year that the schoolchildren are in school in York, PA, and in every other school district across this country. We have picked April 1 to begin daylight saving time. That is approximately halfway through the school year; 161 days have already gone by that the kids have been in school. Those 161 days and days during which the children are in more danger than they are on April 1.

The Sun rises on April 1 at 6:48 in the morning in York, PA. That means that for 161 days, going all the way back to September 16, when the Sun rises at 6:49 in the morning, the children are in more danger than they are on that date. Now, if there is a problem, not just in York, PA, but in Malden, MA, or Dover, DE, or San Diego, CA, then those local school committees ought to change the dates that the school starts, or they ought to put more police on the streets or more school traffic control people out there. But my sense is that most school districts in this country know what to do to protect their children, and they do it. And they do it for 161 days up to April 1. As a result, for the gentleman to come to the floor and say that, all of a sudden on April 1, these children are placed in extraordinarily dangerous circumstances, that belies the fact that for the preceding 161 days there has been a process put in place to protect them.

We have worked out this compromise very carefully. We have not done it with the intention of in fact putting these children in jeopardy but, rather, of protecting them. That is why we have excluded March, excluded February, and excluded November. We are not going back to 1974. That is what the gentleman keeps alluding to, and we are not debating that. We are debating now the lessons learned since then.

We are trying to put it in a time that makes more sense. At 6:58 in the morning, 99.9 percent of the kids in this country are just about leaving their house and the Sun has just come up. That gives them the protection which they need, along with the rest

of the infrastructure that the local community is able to provide.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I have never mentioned 1974. I was running for Congress in 1974 day and night, and I have never mentioned the year 1974. The gentleman keeps saying I am alluding to something in 1974.

Mr. MARKEY. Eleven years. The gentleman mentioned 11 years.

Mr. GOODLING. I am not alluding to anything in 1974.

Mr. MARKEY. You did mention 11 years ago. You mentioned 11 years ago when you were school superintendent, and 11 from 85 is 74.

Mr. GOODLING. But I am not mentioning 1974. I was a superintendent for 7 years and a vice principal for 12 years.

Mr. MARKEY. No, I said the gentleman alluded to it. I said you alluded to it, and 11 from 85 is 74.

Mr. GOODLING. No; I ran for Congress in 1974.

Mr. MARKEY. But 11 from 85 is an allusion. I did not say you specifically mentioned it. I said you alluded to it, and that is in fact what that subtraction gives us.

That is in fact what we are talking about here. We are talking about 1985, not 1974. We are giving children at 6:48 in the morning the sunshine they need to go to school safely.

I think the facts ought to speak for themselves, and the kind of red herring and innuendoes that have characterized this debate over the past couple of years ought to end so that we can deal with the facts as they are presented by the almanac.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SWIFT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman correctly, to the extent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania says there are problems, they already exist, and the proposal of the subcommittee is not creating any new problems. Presumably if problems exist and they are severe, they should be taken care of at the local level. We, in any event with this bill, are not creating any new problems for any school district.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, if the problems are not solved by April 1, they will never be solved, because by April 1, almost every one of these problems has already been solved by the fact that the Sun is already rising

at 6:48 in the morning. Nature has already solved almost every one of the problems to which the gentleman has alluded. If, in fact, there is a problem, it exists in his district and every other district in November, December, January, and February. That is the heart of the winter.

That is when the decisions have to be made at the local level as to when school is going to start, what kind of police protection you want, how many school-crossing guards you want, and all the rest of the attendant questions. But by April 1, the 161st day, these children are dealing with this problem. With 6:48 as the sunrise time, I do not understand what the concern is that could be any worse than it would be the day before and the preceding 161 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

□ 1430

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to again review the situation as I see it.

When someone talks about when the Sun rises or the Sun sets, I am not so sure that there is very much significance to that in any kind of argument in relationship to daylight saving time. For instance, the last four mornings, did anyone see any sunrises in this area? I did not.

As I indicated before, we are talking about critical times in April. We are talking about critical times in November, because they are times when, as a matter of fact, cloudiness is the name of the day, the name of the game. We are talking about temperature changes that cause all sorts of problems. And so we do not really have any good almanac to look at.

Then I would like to refer to what has been mentioned so many times as I mentioned before when we talk about local districts should take care of these issues.

Local districts have to make a lot of decisions in November, December, January, and February, and they do. But again there are rules and regulations and requirements in relationship to how many hours youngsters must go to school. You can only shift 5,000 or 10,000 students around so many times in so many different directions and get the number of hours in that you must get in.

I hear about crossing guards. Where are these crossing guards? Nobody seems to want to talk about rural America. You are talking about people

walking along highways or paths that are used as highways. You are talking about children going to school in the darkness in the middle of a rush hour, because we put them on buses at 6:30 in the morning. We have to do that in order to get them all there on time.

So I would hope that my colleagues would think very seriously about the fact that we have a real problem in November, December, January, February, and March, but nobody is bringing any solution before us to that problem. What is being brought before us is something to add to that problem, because now we would add 1 more week of problems in November and 3 more weeks of problems in April.

Let us think about solutions to those problems, not let us think about ways to compound the problems that we already have.

So again I would ask my colleagues, we have more important things to do I am sure than play around with daylight saving time, but if we are going to, let us think primarily about children, children particularly in rural areas, that must be on that highway at 6:30 or 6:45 in the morning. And if we think about children, then it seems to me we will not ask to exacerbate the problems, but we will come up with some legislation that in fact will help us to correct them.

As one of my colleagues said, "Memorial Day to Labor Day, you could solve a lot of problems there." We should not even be in October, as far as daylight saving time is concerned.

It is a problem. We are just creating more problems and we are putting children on the line. No matter how many charts you put up there, if you are there in person and if you have that responsibility, you understand what those problems are.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, this is a compromise. It is not the bill that came to the floor in 1983 or 1981. It has not even a faint resemblance to the year-round daylight saving time that was in place during the 1974-75 energy crisis. We have struck a balance with the opponents of the 1983 proposal, so that we take April, add it on to the daylight saving time, have the latest sunrise be 6:48 in the morning; 6:48 for a sunrise gives every school system in this country plenty of time to get their kids to school very safely. We are not adding any extra danger to the local school jurisdictions. At the same time we are not removing from the local school jurisdictions their ability to modify by 10 or 15 minutes their ability to be able to start school a little bit later if they should so choose. That is strictly a local decision.

But for the most part, for 95 percent of the people in this country, this is something that they can live with—6:48 in the morning is a reasonable time to have the Sun come up and also be able to get their kids to school.

That is what we really are trying to do here. We also extend daylight saving time to the end of October, an extra few days, so that the kids can trick or treat on that Halloween night with the extra daylight rather than having it on that day be in the morning instead.

In both instances the safety of children has been the primary interest of those who are participating in the compromise. We have no intention of just taking this to pass a bill that allows softball leagues and others to be able to benefit from it. Far from that is in fact true. We have struck a balance. We have got a compromise. It is bipartisan in nature. It reflects the disparate interests of the entire country.

I think that in fact if anyone looks at this bill objectively, they can only come to a conclusion that finally and permanently, we have found a solution that all parts of this country can live with.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA] having assumed the chair, Mr. VOLKMER, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2095) to provide for daylight saving time on an expanded basis, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 288, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 157, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—240

Akaka	Franklin	Morrison (CT)
Alexander	Frenzel	Morrison (WA)
Anderson	Gallo	Murphy
Andrews	Garcia	Murtha
Annunzio	Gaydos	Nichols
Anthony	Gejdenson	Nielson
Archer	Gephardt	Nowak
Aspin	Gibbons	Oakar
Atkins	Gonzalez	Oberstar
AuCoin	Gradison	Ortiz
Barnes	Gray (PA)	Owens
Bartlett	Green	Packard
Barton	Gregg	Parris
Bateman	Grotberg	Pepper
Bates	Guarini	Perkins
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Petri
Bentley	Hatcher	Pickle
Berman	Hawkins	Porter
Biaggi	Hayes	Price
Billirakis	Heftel	Rangel
Bliley	Hertel	Reid
Boner (TN)	Horton	Rinaldo
Bonior (MI)	Howard	Robinson
Bonker	Hoyer	Rodino
Borski	Huckaby	Roe
Boxer	Hughes	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Hunter	Rowland (CT)
Broomfield	Hutto	Roybal
Brown (CA)	Ireland	Russo
Broyhill	Jacobs	Sabo
Bruce	Jeffords	Savage
Bryant	Johnson	Saxton
Burton (CA)	Jones (NC)	Schaefer
Burton (IN)	Kanjorski	Schneider
Callahan	Kaptur	Schroeder
Carper	Kastenmeier	Selberling
Chandler	Kennelly	Sensenbrenner
Chapman	Kildee	Shaw
Clay	Kleczka	Sikorski
Coats	Kolter	Sisk
Cobey	Kostmayer	Smith (FL)
Coble	LaFalce	Smith (NJ)
Coelho	Lagomarsino	Smith, Denny
Collins	Lantos	(OR)
Cooper	Lehman (CA)	Smith, Robert
Coughlin	Lehman (FL)	(NH)
Courter	Leland	Snowe
Coyne	Lent	St Germain
Crane	Levin (MI)	Stark
Crockett	Levine (CA)	Stokes
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Stratton
Dellums	Lewis (FL)	Studds
Dickinson	Lipinski	Swift
Dingell	Long	Synar
DioGuardi	Lowry (WA)	Tauke
Dixon	Lungren	Tauzin
Donnelly	Mack	Thomas (CA)
Dornan (CA)	MacKay	Torres
Dowdy	Manton	Torricelli
Downey	Markey	Towns
Dreier	Martinez	Trafilant
Durbin	Matsui	Valentine
Dwyer	Mavroules	Vander Jagt
Dymally	Mazzoli	Vento
Eckart (OH)	McCollum	Vislosky
Eckert (NY)	McCurdy	Walgren
Edgar	McGrath	Waxman
Edwards (CA)	McKernan	Weiss
Erdreich	McKinney	Wheat
Evans (IL)	McMillan	Whitehurst
Fascell	Meyers	Williams
Fawell	Mica	Wilson
Feighan	Michel	Wirth
Fiedler	Miller (CA)	Wise
Fields	Mineta	Wolf
Fish	Mitchell	Wright
Florio	Moakley	Wyden
Foley	Montgomery	Yates
Ford (MI)	Moody	Yatron
Ford (TN)	Moore	Zschau
Frank	Moorhead	

NAYS—157

Ackerman	Badham	Bennett
Applegate	Barnard	Bereuter
Armey	Bedell	Bevill

Boehlert	Hiller	Roberts
Bosco	Hillis	Roemer
Boucher	Hopkins	Rogers
Boulter	Hubbard	Rose
Breaux	Hyde	Roth
Brown (CO)	Jenkins	Roukema
Bustamante	Jones (OK)	Rowland (GA)
Byron	Jones (TN)	Schuetz
Campbell	Kasich	Schulze
Carney	Kemp	Schumer
Carr	Kindness	Sharp
Chapple	Kolbe	Shumway
Cheney	Kramer	Shuster
Clinger	Latta	Siljander
Combust	Leach (IA)	Skelton
Craig	Leath (TX)	Slattery
Daniel	Lightfoot	Slaughter
Dannemeyer	Lloyd	Smith (NE)
Darden	Loeffler	Smith, Robert
Daschle	Lott	(OR)
Daub	Lujan	Snyder
Davis	Lundine	Solarz
de la Garza	Marlenee	Solomon
Derrick	Martin (IL)	Spence
DeWine	Martin (NY)	Spratt
Dorgan (ND)	McCain	Staggers
Duncan	McCandless	Stallings
Dyson	McCloskey	Stangeland
Emerson	McEwen	Stenholm
English	Mikulski	Strang
Evans (IA)	Miller (WA)	Stump
Flippo	Molinaro	Sweeney
Fowler	Mollohan	Swindall
Fuqua	Monson	Tallon
Gekas	Natcher	Thomas (GA)
Gilman	Neal	Traxler
Gingrich	Obeys	Udall
Glickman	Olin	Volkmer
Goodling	Oxley	Vucanovich
Gordon	Panetta	Walker
Gray (IL)	Pashayan	Watkins
Gunderson	Pease	Weber
Hall, Ralph	Penny	Whitley
Hamilton	Quillen	Whittaker
Hammerschmidt	Rahall	Whitten
Hansen	Ray	Wolpe
Hartnett	Regula	Wortley
Hefner	Richardson	Wyllie
Hendon	Ridge	Young (AK)
Henry	Ritter	

NOT VOTING—37

Addabbo	Frost	Pursell
Boggs	Holt	Rudd
Boland	Livingston	Scheuer
Chappell	Lowery (CA)	Shelby
Coleman (MO)	Lukens	Skeen
Coleman (TX)	Madigan	Smith (IA)
Conte	McDade	Sundquist
Conyers	McHugh	Taylor
Dicks	Miller (OH)	Weaver
Early	Mrazek	Young (FL)
Edwards (OK)	Myers	Young (MO)
Fazio	Nelson	
Foglietta	O'Brien	

□ 1445

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lowery of California for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Messrs. RICHARDSON, DARDEN, LEACH of Iowa, and NATCHER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1455

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

"A TIME OF REMEMBRANCE" FOR VICTIMS OF TERRORISM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 104), to proclaim October 23, 1985, as "A Time of Remembrance" for all victims of terrorism throughout the world, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a second.

This committee passes and brings out many resolutions to the floor. But I think of all of the resolutions we have passed in the 99th Congress, the resolution dealing with terrorism is a very appropriate one for the period in which we live.

I would just like to read, Mr. Speaker, a short paragraph from the resolution itself. It says, "Be proclaimed as 'A Time of Remembrance,' to urge all Americans to take time to reflect on the sacrifices that have been made in the pursuit of peace and freedom, and to promote active participation by the American people through the wearing of a purple ribbon, a symbol of patriotism, dignity, loyalty, and martyrdom."

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, the Senator from the State of New York, and a colleague of ours, the gentleman from New York [Ted Weiss], sent out a "Dear Colleague" letter to all Members on both sides of the aisle in this House, as well as the other body. It dealt with a resolution on the assassination and slaying of Mr. Klinghoffer. Mr. Klinghoffer, as you know, was the person who was assassinated by the terrorists on board the Italian ship in the Mediterranean.

I would just like my colleagues to know that I hope we all take the opportunity to read that "Dear Colleague" letter. I would hope that we would all sign on it and I would hope that it would be possible that we will have unanimous consent in this body

to deal with that resolution as well as in the other body, because I think Mr. Klinghoffer really stands as a symbol of a person who was not afraid to stand up, even though he was handicapped and in a wheelchair.

I think the name Klinghoffer will live for a long, long time in all of our hearts and our memories.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for allowing me these few minutes to speak on behalf of this resolution.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding to me. I want to express my appreciation to my friend from New York [Mr. GARCIA] for both the expeditious manner in which he and his subcommittee handled this particular resolution, which is authored by our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICAL] and also for his words of support for the resolution that was introduced in the other body and here by myself and the junior Senator from New York, Mr. D'AMATO.

There may have been some confusion in how the stories were carried as to what the medal is being spoken about. It is not the Congressional Medal of Honor. As my colleagues know, that is a battlefield honor reserved for members of the U.S. Armed Forces who demonstrate very special acts of courage and bravery.

The medal we are talking about is the Congressional Gold Medal of Achievement. It has been given in the past to civilians whose life work or whose specific actions in fact merited special note by the American people and by this Congress.

I do appreciate my colleague from New York [Mr. GARCIA] urging unanimous support for that resolution. I hope that my colleagues will, in fact, join and become cosponsors.

Mr. Klinghoffer, indeed, was a brave and courageous human being, who although may have been paralyzed, that is half of his body was paralyzed, fought courageously against the men who ultimately murdered him so viciously.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments of both gentlemen from New York. And I would like to add to it, if I may, in America today, as we read the paper and we look at TV, we see this constant outcry of terrorism cropping its ugly head up from various places around the world. It seems like every week or two there is another incident coming about.

I personally feel that government can no longer tolerate this. The time has come when people of good faith,

and people with humanistic types of thinking will not tolerate this type of activity being conducted.

I must say that in my humble opinion, terrorists are the ultimate cowards of the world, that they prey on children, and the weak and the maimed, like Mr. Klinghoffer and others who cannot really protect themselves. I think this is one of the most outstanding instances of man's inhumanity to man, that is someone who becomes involved in a terroristic thing.

I compliment the President of the United States for the action he recently took. I compliment the people of Italy and of Egypt who assisted in that. I would hope in this body, in these Chambers where laws are passed and principles and policies are made, that we have courage enough to stand up against terrorism in any form. I compliment the people of the world today who have courage enough to stand up against it.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. I thank my friend for yielding. I want to compliment him for the comment he just made in complimenting in addition to the President, our friends in Egypt and in Italy for the actions they took.

I have been concerned that over the last few days, some of our very valuable allies, and especially a man I have great respect for, the President of Egypt, Mr. Mubarak, who I had a chance to meet with 1½ years ago, that perhaps there have been some comments made that were not really accurate and not really in the right feeling that we should have toward valuable allies like the President of Egypt. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his comment, and would also like to stand in compliment of the actions taken on this resolution and I stand in strong support of it.

□ 1510

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say, I am sure we have some differences of opinion the way that possibly was handled, but hopefully we would work together for the betterment of handling the situation; and those minor differences can be resolved amicably among the nations.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 104

Whereas the problem of terrorism has become an international concern that knows

no boundaries—religious, racial, political, or national;

Whereas thousands of men, women, and children have died at the hands of terrorists in nations around the world, and today terrorism continues to claim the lives of many peace-loving individuals;

Whereas October 23, 1983, is the date on which the largest number of Americans were killed in a single act of terrorism—the bombing of the United States compound in Beirut, Lebanon, in which two hundred and forty-one United States servicemen lost their lives;

Whereas many of these victims died defending ideals of peace and freedom; and

Whereas it is appropriate to honor all victims of terrorism, and in America to console the families of victims, and to cherish the freedom that their sacrifices make possible for all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 23, 1985, be proclaimed as "A Time of Remembrance", to urge all Americans to take time to reflect on the sacrifices that have been made in the pursuit of peace and freedom, and to promote active participation by the American People through the wearing of a purple ribbon, a symbol of patriotism, dignity, loyalty, and martyrdom. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the departments and agencies of the United States and interested organizations, groups, and individuals to fly United States flags at half staff throughout the world in the hope that the desire for peace and freedom take firm root in every person and every nation.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 104, the Senate joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A SHAMELESS EXPOSURE

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning "The Phil Donahue Show" on network television, and carried across the country in syndication reaching millions of people, hosted the Communist President of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega.

Now, you and I both know, Mr. Speaker, that Phil Donahue, Irish last name notwithstanding, is the No. 1 anti-Catholic bigot in the United States as far as widespread negative impact on our beloved church is con-

cerned. Phil Donahue is to Catholicism what Lewis Farrakhan is to Judaism. If this Donahue were to attack Jews or blacks or any other ethnic or racial group the way he attacks the Catholic Church I love, he would be kicked off the air by any of the networks. But, Mr. Speaker, remember what Arthur Schlesinger has said for decades. Anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of the pseudo-intellectual left.

So it was a peculiar thing to see Donahue, given his hatred of Catholicism, pressing Ortega about his persecution of a man I have called the most courageous clergyman in this hemisphere, Bishop Miguel Obando y Bravo. Donahue, of course, pressed the case weakly about Ortega trying to crush religion. He mostly verbally dusted off Ortega's shoes. Donahue did bring up the testimony of Alvaro Jose Baldizon, a man who defected from the highest levels of Tomas Borge's Ministry of the Interior. Baldizon has told ghastly stories of Communist murder and torture by the Sandinistas inside Nicaragua.

Baldizon, unfortunately, has met with only eight or nine Congressmen. He told me there are 10 times as many political prisoners as under the hated dictator Somoza. He said there is wholesale capital punishment, and that he couldn't take the unrelenting murder and torture.

This scene was bizarre, of Ortega reaching out to the American people on "The Donahue Show" and challenging our President to come down to Managua and speak to the Nicaraguan people on television as Ortega was doing, through a simultaneous translator.

Well, Mr. Ortega, I accept that offer as a supporter of the President's policies. I hope other Members will. I would like to go down to Managua and plead again for the brother and the wife of Mr. Baldizon. They have been imprisoned and abused because Baldizon, obviously, speaks the truth.

When Donahue brought up Baldizon's wife and imprisoned brother, Ortega looked as if he had been hit in the forehead with a ball peen hammer. Mrs. Ortega, who speaks perfect English, and the translator were also stunned and fished for an answer. Ortega said that if Baldizon's brother is in jail, it is because of offenses that the brother committed. Ortega, of course, denied that he holds 10,000 political prisoners. The show was, all in all, Mr. Speaker, an inadvertent unmasking of a Communist dictator on a man's program who gags on the word "Communist." Phil Donahue is not alone in his aversion to using the proper description of a Communist as a Communist. We have more than a few members in this chamber with the same hangup.

By the way, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Donahue, a Notre Dame alumnus, has publicly condemned the kidnaping of President Duarte's daughter in El Salvador. Mr. Duarte is a fellow Notre Dame alumnus.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a rather surprising newspaper column of today, October 22, by Mary McGrory. See for yourself, she is beginning to see the light, flickering though her insight may be:

ORTEGA'S SELF-INFLICTED WOUNDS

(By Mary McGrory)

If ever they give an Oscar for bad timing, there will be no need to ask for the envelope. President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua will be the winner, going away.

He laid heavy claim to the title last April, when, within days of a hard-won House of Representatives vote against aid to the contras, he took wing for Moscow, occasioning anguished cries of "betrayal" from those who had nervously taken up for him, and "I-told-you-so" from those who all along said he is an agent of the Kremlin.

But he cinched the cup last week, when on the eve of a visit to the United Nations, he announced a state of emergency in Nicaragua, setting off a new frenzy of hand-wringing and self-righteousness.

It can be argued, although few have, that Ortega, being the elected head of a sovereign nation, however, impoverished and down at the heels it may be, can do as he pleases in what he sees as his country's interest. Despite President Reagan's overheated representations to the contrary, we do not own Nicaragua, and its Marxist leanings are really none of our business, since Nicaragua's ability to "export revolution" is a fiction invented by those who want Ortega to say "uncle."

And it is further arguable that the reasons given by Ortega, which are vague and flimsy, are totally related to his principal problem, which is a U.S.-backed revolution against his shaky regime.

But what the move shows most is that Ortega has not lost his compulsion to play into Reagan's hands. Countless congressional delegations have gone to Managua to plead with him to employ a slightly less leaden touch and to give them a break in their efforts to defend his right not to be overthrown. They are sadly concluding that he has developed a taste for spitting in Uncle Sam's eye.

Quite apart from the fact that Ortega has come to the U.N. as a culprit instead of as a figure of some sympathy, he chose a moment when things were going rather well for Nicaragua in public opinion, mostly because world attention has been elsewhere.

The Nicaraguan ambassador, Carlos Tunnermann, recently noted that not a single country has joined in the trade embargo imposed by the United States—not even El Salvador, which alone voiced support for the idea. In the World Court, where Nicaragua has lodged a complaint against the U.S. for the mining of its harbors, the U.S. has looked petty for its denial of court jurisdiction over "a political matter."

The verdict, which is expected to go Nicaragua's way, is pending, but Ortega has taken pains to see that the victory will be muddled.

None of the individuals or groups who stick up for the Sandinistas, or at least their right to exist, can justify the crackdown. Rev. Joseph Eldredge of the Washington

Office on Latin America calls it "perplexing and discouraging."

Paul Reichler, the Washington attorney who is presenting Nicaragua's case in the World Court, says the timing is "not the best."

The State Department doubtless knew that Ortega was in the way of being warmly received in some quarters in the U.S. That is almost surely why it withheld a visa permitting him to travel outside New York until late last Friday—when it was too late for him to accept speaking invitations from some half-dozen American cities, including Seattle, St. Louis and San Francisco.

The Socialist Mayor of Burlington, Vt., Bernard Sanders, went to Nicaragua last July and asked Ortega to come to a Vermont town meeting. Sanders thought it was "important for Ortega to communicate directly with the American people." He thinks the Ortega crackdown is "obviously not good."

"Still," he says, "I think it's kind of ironic that we're so upset, when the president has been telling us for two years that this is a totalitarian, terrorist government where people had no civil rights anyway."

Mayor Don Fraser (D) of Minneapolis, who deplores U.S. policy in Nicaragua, wrote a letter to Ortega seconding an invitation from a church group, thinks Ortega "may have given up on the U.S." Fraser is more interested in the fact that the letter he sent to Ortega through the Nicaraguan Embassy seems to have been intercepted by the government.

Supposedly, there has been a lull in the fighting between the Sandinistas and the contras, who are once again receiving U.S. funding. Ortega, it is said, wanted to clear the decks before a last, conclusive assault, and he wished to curb his most obdurate and powerful local dissenter, Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo, who is leading an antidraft campaign.

Whoever he was aiming at, Ortega, once again, seems to have shot himself.

**YOUTH EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY WAGE ACT**

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1811, the Youth Employment Opportunity Wage Act, and urge my colleagues to give this bill the hearing it deserves and to enact it into law.

I can understand the qualms some Members have had in the past about the general approach of a youth opportunity wage. I was proud to join my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1811 because this legislation answers the questions and reasonable criticisms that had been raised about previous proposals.

This bill will create new jobs for young people aged 16 to 19, not steal jobs from current employees. In the relatively rare situations when an employer might be tempted to substitute at the lower wage, he or she would be sufficiently discouraged by the strong

sanctions in the bill, including stiff fines and prison terms.

Second, the fact that the opportunity wage would apply only from May through September would further act to make these new jobs suitable for young people.

This bill will also allow us to better harness the most powerful engine for job-creation in our economy: Small business. Nearly 600,000 new businesses start up each year. Yet most small businesses do not reach their break-even point for several years. This fact, coupled with less access to expensive tax advice, means that the economic sector that creates the most jobs has less opportunity to use the targeted jobs tax credit. The youth opportunity wage would help make up the difference, by providing small businesses with an incentive to create additional entry-level jobs for youth.

The additional advantages of the opportunity wage are obvious. The young person gains skills and experience, an employment history, and the invaluable assets of increased self-reliance and self-esteem.

I urge all my colleagues to join with us, with the Boys Clubs of America, the National Conference of Black Mayors, the Fraternal Order of Police, and others, in supporting legislation that is both compassionate and economical.

I would also like to insert in the RECORD a partial list of organizations supporting the opportunity wage.

Associations which support the youth employment opportunity wage bill:

American Association of Nurserymen, Inc.
American Farm Bureau.
American Furniture Manufacturers Association.
American G.I. Forum.
American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Incorporated.
Associated Builders and Contractors.
Boys Clubs of America.
Business Round Table.
The National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Services Organizations.
Food Service and Lodging Institute.
Fraternal Order of Police.
National Alliance of Business.
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.
National Association of Cuban-American Women and Men.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Minority Contractors.
National Association of Truck Stop Operators.
National Association of Wholesale Distributors.
National Club Association.
National Conference of Black Mayors.
National Federation of Independent Business.
National Restaurant Association.
National Small Business Association.
Organization of Chinese American Women.
Printing Industries of America.

Retail Bakers Association.
Recreational Vehicle Dealers Association.
SER-Jobs for Progress, Inc.
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

□ 1230

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF SOVIET CITIZENS WORKING AT THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. SWINDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will substantially limit the number of Soviet citizens serving at the Soviet mission to the United Nations. Specifically, this legislation would reduce the number of Soviet citizens serving at the mission to the equivalent of the number of United States citizens serving at the U.S. mission.

Today there are approximately 295 Soviet citizens serving at the United Nations. The United States has only 130. It is obvious that if the Soviets have roughly double the number of Soviet citizens serving at the mission, there must be another purpose. Clearly, the purpose is more than diplomatic. Recent stories regarding the Soviet espionage efforts in this country ought to alert all of us that these individuals are serving not the United Nations but rather the Soviet Union, and their espionage efforts.

I urge all of my colleagues to take this opportunity, the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, to seriously re-evaluate both the purpose of the United Nations and the number of Soviets serving at the United Nations and take this opportunity to reduce the number of Soviets at the United Nations to the equivalent of the United States. Certainly our national security demands nothing short of that.

I urge all of my colleagues that are concerned about our national security to join me in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this bill, as was the driving force behind previous amendments introduced by Senators COHEN and LEAHY, is simply to reduce the significant threat that the Soviet and Eastern bloc spies have on our national security by reducing the number of Soviet officials sheltered by the United Nations. Serious harm is being done every day to United States national security by allowing the United Nations to be a "Spy Sanctuary." The concept is very elementary, the less spies you have, the less intelligence activities there are.

From recent spy cases, we have learned of the magnitude of this Soviet presence in our country. These recent cases have unfortunately involved the U.S. military, defense contractors, and also our own intelligence agencies.

The FBI has estimated between one-third and 40 percent of this "staff" are professional intelligence officers. The remainder are presumed to be affiliated with the KGB, GRU—the Soviet military intelligence organization, or East bloc intelligence services. These agents engage in a variety of activities, including collecting information, searching for and recruiting Americans willing to reveal sensitive information.

With the upcoming 40th anniversary of the United Nations next week, it seems only appropriate to give this international forum a birthday present of lasting value, a better reputation and purpose. In addition, it's time for Congress to assess the problems that this institution presents to our Nation.

Over the last several years the United Nations has become an international institution which has strayed from its original intentions and purpose. Anyone who is seriously concerned about both our national security and the United Nations itself should be very concerned with the number of Soviet and Eastern bloc spies currently operating out of the Soviet mission to the United Nations in New York.

With this in mind, I am introducing legislation that will reduce the excessive size of the Soviet mission to the United Nations in New York. My bill will establish a policy requiring numerically equivalent U.N. delegations from both the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Specifically, this bill would require the Soviet mission to the United Nations, currently about 300 officials, be reduced to equivalence with that of the United States, about 130 personnel.

This bill is a logical successor to the Leahy-Cohen amendment limiting the number of officials allowed to work in the Soviet's U.S. Embassy and Consulate which was recently signed into law by the President. In addition, this bill is the companion bill to S. 1773, already introduced by Senators LEAHY and COHEN. This concept was also endorsed by the President in his June 21, 1985, national radio broadcast.

Clearly, this bill could greatly reduce Soviet intelligence operations in our country and at the same time help the United Nations shake its reputation of being a sanctuary for spies. What better time than at the 40th birthday of the United Nations to deliver a message that the United States is serious about the United Nations getting back on track as an international forum which helps solve world problems instead of contributing to them.

The text of my bill and a recent report by former Ambassador Lichenstein follow:

H.R. 3600

A bill to limit the number of Soviet nationals serving at the Soviet mission to the United Nations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) the number of nationals of the Soviet Union admitted to the United States to serve as members of the Soviet mission at the United Nations headquarters shall not exceed the number of United States nationals who serve as members of the United

States mission at the United Nations headquarters, unless—

(A) the excess number of nationals of the Soviet Union serving as members of the Soviet mission at the United Nations headquarters is the result of the routine replacement of personnel and is not more than 10 percent of the number of United States nationals who serve as members of the United States mission at the United Nations headquarters; or

(B) the President determines that the admission to the United States of additional Soviet nationals to serve as members of the Soviet mission at the United Nations headquarters would be in the interests of the United States.

(2) Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the number of Soviet nationals admitted during the preceding six-month period to the United States pursuant to a determination of the President under paragraph (1)(B) and their duties with the Soviet mission at the United Nations headquarters.

(3) Nothing in this subsection may be construed as including any dependent or spouse who is not a member of a mission at the United Nations headquarters in the calculation of the number of members of a mission at the United Nations headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of State and the Attorney General should, not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, prepare and transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for ensuring that the number of Soviet nationals described in subsection (a)(1) does not exceed the limitation described in that subsection.

(c) For purposes of this Act—
(1) the terms "members of the Soviet mission" and "members of the United States mission" are used within the meaning of the term "members of the mission", as defined by Article 1(b) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done April 18, 1961; and

(2) the term "mission at the United Nations headquarters" means a mission to the United Nations in New York City and includes missions in New York City to specialized agencies of the United Nations, as defined in Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations.

[From Background, the Heritage Foundation, Sept. 9, 1985]

SOVIET ESPIONAGE: USING THE U.N. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

(By Charles M. Lichenstein, Senior Fellow)

INTRODUCTION

With mounting concern, the West is discovering an escalating threat to its security posed by Soviet espionage. The U.S. government is prosecuting the Walker family on charges of giving military secrets to Moscow, while the West German government reels from revelations that some of its top security officials secretly have been working for East Germany. Ripples of this

West German spy scandal already have reached Britain and Switzerland.

Dwarfing these as spy threats is a Kremlin-directed espionage center thriving inside the United States. At risk are, among other things, the secrets of U.S. weapons, strategic military planning, high technology, advanced manufacturing processes, industrial innovations, and biotech and biogenetic research breakthroughs. Espionage against these targets weakens not only U.S. military defenses, but undermines U.S. worldwide economic competitiveness.

What makes the U.S. particularly vulnerable to this espionage are the convenient cover and access enjoyed by the spies. They are diplomats and bureaucrats with a status even more privileged than diplomats. Not only do they operate out of Soviet bloc and Soviet client-state embassies to the U.S., but more important—and much more valuable to the Kremlin—they use as a base the diplomatic missions, agencies and secretariats affiliated with the United Nations, in the heart of Manhattan.

Their numbers run into the hundreds. At least one in three of all Soviet, East bloc and client-state diplomats posted to the United States engages in espionage. This is the confident consensus of U.S. intelligence experts. The term, espionage, covers a multitude of abuses of diplomatic privilege: information collection (by open and covert means, including electronic intercepts), acquisition of military and industrial technology (some of it purchased off-the-shelf, some of it stolen), recruitment and supervision of agents (some but by no means all of whom are U.S. nationals), and an array of "active measures" that involve, among others, propaganda, spreading "disinformation" and using front groups.

The estimate of one in three, in fact, appears quite conservative. It is based, The Heritage Foundation has learned from official U.S. sources, on the actual record of confirmed case histories. It probably would be much more accurate to conclude that one in two Soviet bloc and client-state diplomats is involved in espionage, warn Soviet and East bloc defectors, many of whom were KGB (Soviet State Security), GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence) or East bloc counterparts. This is confirmed by Arkady Shevchenko, former U.N. Under-Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs, one of the highest ranking Soviet officials ever to defect to the West. Shevchenko writes in *Breaking With Moscow* (published this year) that, of 28 Soviet bloc "international civil servants" in his especially sensitive unit in the U.N. Secretariat, at least 21 spent some or all of their duty hours on intelligence assignments, in New York and elsewhere, under KGB control.

These numbers constitute a formidable challenge to U.S. counterintelligence forces. The danger to U.S. national security is beyond question.

THE UNIQUE VALUE OF THE U.N.

There are two distinct parts to the diplomat-espionage problem. The first is inherent in the normal, reciprocal exchange of diplomats capital-to-capital (such as between Washington and Moscow) or major city-to-major city (such as between the consulates in Leningrad and San Francisco). The Soviets post several hundred diplomats to Washington; the U.S. posts a similar number to Moscow; each group is a mix, as both sides know perfectly well, of diplomats and intelligence agents. Even on this regular diplomatic level, however, the Soviets enjoy the advantage of supplementing their own

staffs with East Germans, Bulgarians, Cubans, Afghans, and other Soviet bloc and client-state diplomats. Against key targets, they operate as a single, unified hierarchy, with the Soviet KGB at the top. By contrast, the U.S. maintains only loose, informal ties with the intelligence services of its Western allies, Israel, and a few other countries.

To make matters worse, the U.S. suffers from self-inflicted wounds in this diplomatic tradeoff. The total American diplomat and non-diplomat complement in Moscow is substantially smaller than the Soviet Mission in Washington: 202 vs. 495 (with 79 more Soviets currently en route). The Soviets, moreover, hire almost no local, American employees for the non-professional positions at their Washington embassy, but bring to the U.S. Soviet citizens to serve as embassy caretakers, mechanics, drivers and the like. The U.S., distressingly, uses mostly Soviet nationals for these jobs in Moscow. The result: 224 Soviet citizens, under the direct control of their government, now work inside the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. It is no wonder that the KGB was able to dust U.S. Embassy telephones, chairs, auto seats and other objects with carcinogenic nitrophenylpentadienol powder to track the movements of U.S. diplomats in Moscow.

The second part of the diplomat-espionage problem is even more serious. It is the unique circumstance of the U.S. serving as host country to United Nations headquarters in New York City. Here, of course, there is no tradeoff or reciprocity. All the risk is borne by the U.S., for the U.S.S.R. hosts no United Nations—or other truly international—body. For the Soviet bloc and its clients, "diplomatic" presence at and because of the U.N. is pure espionage gravy.

At the U.N., there are official missions of the Soviet Union, its satellites and clients (plus the observer missions of such non-U.N. members as North Korea, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the South West Africa People's Organization). Alongside the official U.N. missions is the U.N. itself—the huge Secretariat, plus headquarters of the U.N. Development Program (UNDP) and UNICEF (the U.N. Children's Fund). Employment totals more than 15,000, of whom 371 are from the Soviet Union, plus another 225 from the East bloc and the client states. As with Soviet bloc diplomatic personnel, these U.N. employees are a mix of genuine benign bureaucrats and intelligence agents.

Taken together, these components define the parameters of the problem posed by the U.N. as a "sanctuary for spies" in the U.S. It is a problem that the U.S. imposes on itself, for no one forces it to play host to the United Nations.

THE NUMBERS

To present the situation in the most cautious way, the number of Soviet-related diplomat-spies is calculated to underestimate the magnitude of the problem. As such, Albania, the People's Republic of China and Democratic Kampuchea (Cambodia) are not counted. Albania maintains nearly complete isolation from the Soviets and the Soviet world generally; China cannot be considered part of any Soviet-led bloc (although its U.N. Mission and Secretariat personnel in New York may pose a security threat of another kind); and Democratic Kampuchea is still represented at the U.N. by a coalition of opposition forces, partly anti-Communist and wholly anti-Soviet. Iran also is excluded, even though its ties to the international terrorist network pose a clear security threat to the U.S.

Adding together all Soviet bloc and client-state nationals who are on the staffs of their countries' missions to the U.N. or who work for the U.N., the total comes to 1,204 potential agents of espionage in the U.S. because of the U.N.

SOVIET AND BLOC NATIONALS IN NEW YORK

	Dips	Support staff	U.N. Sec'l	UNDP	UNICEF
Afghanistan	4	6	16	5	1
Bulgaria ¹	11	12	14		
Cuba	35	21	26	1	2
Czechoslovakia ¹	12	9	17		
German Dem. Republic ¹	13	13	13		
Hungary ¹	11	9	15		
Libya ¹	10	16	9	0	0
Mongolia	5	1	0	0	0
Nicaragua ¹	17	0	6		
North Korea	0	20	0	0	0
PLO	0	7	25	0	0
Poland ¹	10	9	40		
Romania ¹	7	5	10		
USSR	117	178	331	1	1
(Byelorussia)	9	5	11	0	0
(Ukraine)	10	8	27	0	0
Vietnam	15	11	15	1	1
Totals	286	330	575	8	5
Grand total			1,204		

¹ No breakdown by agency is available for these countries. The total also has been adjusted for a few U.N. employees located other than in NYC.

² Libyan nationals in New York uniquely, are restricted to the five boroughs of the city.

Sources: all data from lists maintained by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. Diplomatic and support lists as of June 30, 1985; U.N. data as of mid-to late-1984.

Still the total is too low. Most of these "diplomats" and "international civil servants" are accompanied by spouses and/or adult dependents. On the basis of confirmed case histories, U.S. intelligence experts believe that they too undertake espionage assignments of various kinds. Supporting this assessment are defector reports. Assuming conservatively only one spouse or adult dependent for each mission official or U.N. employee, the total doubles to some 2,408 potential security threats to the U.S.

Using the one-in-three estimate, the number of actual agents that can be used by Moscow totals about 800. Using the one-in-two ratio urged by Soviet defectors, the number of actual agents is about 1,200. Even those diplomats and U.N. bureaucrats who engage in no espionage cause problems for the U.S., for the very fact that they are on tap complicates the U.S. counterintelligence challenge greatly.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

All of the experts consulted, from federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, agree that effective countermeasures against the enormous threat posed by 800 to 1,200 espionage operatives must proceed along two parallel and complementary tracks: (1) every reasonable means must be used to limit the numbers of potential Soviet-related espionage agents in the U.S. and to limit their freedom of operation; (2) U.S. counterintelligence resources must be enhanced substantially.

LIMITING SOVIET U.N.-RELATED ESPIONAGE

For almost 40 years, the U.S. Government has had all the authority it needs to crack down on the U.N.-related Soviet threat to national security. P.L. 357, enacted in 1947, clarified the Headquarters Agreement of November 21, 1947, which governs the U.S.-U.N. host country relationship. In section 6, this law states that "nothing in the Agreement shall be construed as in any way diminishing, abridging or weakening the right of the United States to safeguard its own security" and in particular "completely to

control the entrance of aliens into any territory of the United States other than the (U.N.) headquarters district and its immediate vicinity."

Under this authority, the U.S. restricts the freedom of movement of Soviet and some bloc diplomats at U.N. missions to an area of 25 miles from the U.N.'s New York headquarters. To do the work that legitimately brings them to the U.S., this is all the freedom they need. In 1982, in the Foreign Missions Act, Congress set up administrative machinery within the State Department in an effort to make these travel restrictions tighter.

Although the 1947 Act makes absolutely no distinction between diplomats and any other class of "aliens" no restrictions ever have been imposed on U.N. bureaucrats. As a result, in this year's State Department Authorization Act, Congress made its intent clear beyond any doubt or administrative fudging. The Roth-Hyde Amendment, named for its principal co-sponsors, Senator William V. Roth, Jr. (R-Delaware) and Representative Henry J. Hyde (R-Illinois), extends to all foreign nationals at the U.N. the restrictions that now or may in the future apply to their countries' U.N. missions. There is to be no more free ride for those "international civil servants" who are known to report routinely to their U.N. missions, to receive orders from their governments, and even to kick back part of their U.N. paychecks.

The mandate of Congress is unequivocal. Effective follow-up action by the State Department and the U.S. Mission to the U.N.—even by the U.N. itself—is now called for, in the following directions:

(1) *The Roth-Hyde Amendment went into effect last week; it should be vigorously enforced.*—There is no law or international convention, nor any U.S. host country obligation, that allows U.S. "guests" to break American laws or threaten U.S. national security. The most effective enforcement of the Amendment would be to require prior notification by the U.N. Secretary General of all official U.N. travel (which would alert U.S. counterintelligence agencies to potential security threats and enable them to deny permission in some cases). Further, U.N. employees who are citizens of countries under restriction should be required to request permission for "private" travel. Such unofficial travel should almost always be denied.

(2) *The list restricting travel should be expanded.*—None of the East European Soviet satellites is now on the restricted list. Yet their diplomats and nationals at the U.N. pose an obvious and serious security threat to the U.S. The same is true for Nicaragua. The status of the People's Republic of China is ambiguous. Its New York-based diplomats already enjoy special privileges: they are free of all travel restrictions to 29 "open cities" embracing virtually every major metropolitan area in the U.S. This would not be curtailed by the Roth-Hyde Amendment. Although China is no Soviet satellite, official U.S. sources confide that Beijing's agents in the U.S. are deeply engaged in industrial espionage.

(3) *The size of some U.N. missions should be reduced.*—The Soviet Mission to the U.N. totals 295—when Byelorussia and the Ukraine are added, the total is 327. By contrast, the U.S. Mission to the U.N. gets by with about one-third this number. Surely, Moscow is taking advantage of the U.S. in its role as host country. Similarly, Cuba has a staff of 56 at its U.N. mission, about the

same size as major West European nations whose involvement in U.N. official business is generally much heavier than Havana's. The matter has run out of control. The State Department immediately should define "reasonable ranges" for mission size, based on such generally accepted U.N. criteria as a country's population and wealth, and the scale of assessed contributions to the U.N. budget. This would force a cut back mainly in Soviet bloc missions and thus reduce the number of potential spies.

(4) *The U.S. should stop subsidizing espionage against the U.S.*—The U.S. currently pays 25 percent of the salaries of U.N. employees. This includes, of course, those who receive and submit to instructions from their governments (including instructions to spy). This is in clear violation of Article 100 of the U.N. Charter. Another related Charter abuse that the U.S. tolerates is "secondment," by which the Soviets assign their nationals to the Secretariat on contract and replace them at will. This puts an effective lock on certain key positions—in personnel, public information and Political and Security Council Affairs, for example, whose chief always is a Soviet national—and enables the Soviets to establish permanent espionage outposts within the U.N. Secretariat. The U.S. should demand that the Secretary General put an end to these Charter violations. Failing prompt, effective action, the U.S. should withhold the appropriate portion of its annual assessment.

INCREASING U.S. COUNTERINTELLIGENCE RESOURCES

Even without the U.N.-related security threat, strengthening U.S. counterintelligence capabilities is an urgent priority for the FBI, CIA and other law enforcement agencies. The espionage charges against the Walker family make this clear. U.S. counterintelligence must be rebuilt after its systematic destruction during the 1970s. It is a long and slow process. Of all intelligence specialties, none is more demanding or dependent on experience than counterintelligence. Since 1981, the U.S. has begun to rebuild; more must be done. Such as:

(1) *FBI counterintelligence forces in New York should be increased substantially.*—More FBI agents are urgently required in New York City to monitor potential espionage activities related to the U.N. The U.S. is now in the first year of a five-year FBI expansion program, which will increase the FBI counterintelligence force by about 50 percent nationwide. Exactly how many agents the FBI needs, and how many should be posted in New York, is classified information. The President, the Attorney General and the Congress—the two Intelligence Committees in particular—have the obligation to assure themselves and the American people that the U.S. is spending what it must to rebuild a counterintelligence capability fully in line with the Soviet threat, including the U.N.-related part of the threat—and on the fastest possible track.

(2) *Adequate support staff and services should be provided.*—More agents alone will not get the job done. Required, too, are telecommunications equipment, data banks, stenotypists, and surveillance and other specialists. The simple lack of an adequate motor pool, for example, can abort an entire U.S. counterintelligence operation. In addition, collaboration among all American law enforcement and intelligence agencies is essential. Currently in New York, cooperation is excellent among the FBI, U.S. mission security staff and the superb New York City Police counterintelligence forces. The Presi-

dent and Congress must ensure the same high level of teamwork within the U.S. intelligence community, particularly between the CIA and the FBI. Almost by definition, Soviet-directed espionage at the U.N. is a cross-border matter, justifying CIA involvement.

(3) *Counterintelligence laws and guidelines should be reviewed.*—A key element of the systematic attack of the 1970s on U.S. intelligence capabilities was the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1974 (FISA). This was supplemented by Department of Justice guidelines. Most U.S. law enforcement and intelligence officials say that neither FISA (which established a special U.S. court to pass on the legality of wiretaps) nor the Justice Department guidelines seriously inhibit effective counterintelligence operations. Yet outside experts and former counterintelligence agents insist that FISA and the guidelines have a "chilling effect." Among other things, they discourage agents from even requesting especially sensitive surveillance efforts. Thus, while the special court almost always says "yes" to requests, it does so in part because it never gets the really tough ones. The President, the Attorney General and Congress must review the law and guidelines for just such crippling defects.

(4) *The U.S., presence within the U.N. Secretariat should be strengthened.*—Increased presence within the U.N. Secretariat of tough-minded fully qualified U.S. professionals could inhibit the activities of Soviet bloc spies. Americans inside the Secretariat, moreover, could monitor the situation better than any outside agents. They could spot suspicious behavior—sometimes nothing more than a Bulgarian or Russian who almost never turns up in the office. And they could report their observations to appropriate U.S. officials without compromising their roles as legitimate international civil servants.

THE "UNIVERSAL" SOLUTION

Another way to bring potential Soviet agents at the U.N. under more effective control would be to break up the routine, predictable pattern of the U.N. operation. A useful first step would be to keep moving the annual three-month session of the U.N. General Assembly; one year it could convene in Moscow, the next in Geneva, following that in Nairobi, and so on. This was proposed in 1981 by former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick and endorsed in principle by President Reagan. By rotating the U.N. venue, the bulk of the U.N. missions and the massive U.N. bureaucracy would be operating outside New York and the U.S. for at least three months annually. The U.N. sanctuary for espionage targeted against the U.S. would be severely disrupted.

If all else fails, then the U.S. must protect itself against U.N.-based espionage by pressing for the ultimate option: moving the U.N. out of the U.S. altogether and inviting the organization to find a new home elsewhere. From the perspective of U.S. national security, it makes a great deal of sense.

The State Department and its supportive "establishment" would, of course, argue that by such an act the U.S. would be turning its back on its worldwide responsibilities. In Moscow or Geneva or Nairobi, however, as in New York, the U.S. would be able to play whatever role it wished to play in the U.N., which might even become more serious and businesslike.

CONCLUSION

All of the above recommendations are mutually reinforcing. If all were pursued, the security threat posed by the privileged sanctuary for spies provided by the U.N. could be brought under effective control.

Restrictions on Soviet and bloc diplomats' freedom to move at will within the U.S., now extended by the Roth-Hyde Amendment to Soviet bloc U.N. bureaucrats, should be rigorously enforced; the list of countries under restriction should be expanded to include the entire East European bloc; suspiciously overstaffed U.N. missions should be cut back; and the U.S. should stop paying its 25 percent share of the salaries of U.N. employees who clearly are under the control of their governments. These actions would begin to reduce the number of potential spies to manageable proportions.

The problem can be managed, moreover, by increased U.S. counterintelligence resources, adequately supported by staff and services, further backed up by a strong U.S. presence inside the U.N. secretariat and rid of unnecessary restraints on their operational freedom.

If the U.S. is really serious about turning back the U.N.-related Soviet threat to its national security, an arsenal of varied and effective weapons is at hand.

CLOSING LOOPHOLES SHOULD BE GOAL OF TAX REFORM

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan sent his comprehensive tax reform proposal to the Congress earlier this year, I sensed a bipartisan willingness to take on the special interests by closing the loopholes, broadening the tax base and lowering tax rates.

Since that time, those of us who strongly favor tax reform have been urged to "keep our powder dry" as the bill works its way through the committee system. But, while many of us have tried to do just that, the special interests have been far from silent. The loophole lobby has unloaded broadside after broadside on the committee while we held back.

Let us consider what has happened as we kept our powder dry.

Commercial banks, hardly among the truly need in our economy, have a new, improved, wider loophole by which they can avoid paying their fair share of taxes. Instead of going forward with tax reform, we appear to be moving backward.

Millions of unemployed workers will now see taxes levied on all their unemployment compensation benefits.

Perhaps the money raised from this tax increase will finance the tax dodges of those who raise and breed race horses. As the tax committee voted to raise taxes on the jobless, it acted to preserve tax breaks for horse racers.

Is this tax reform? I ask my colleagues: How many of your constituents define tax reform as new loopholes for banks, a new tax on unemployment benefits and a preservation of tax breaks for the horsey set?

If we want real tax reform, we have to be willing to curtail loopholes, not widen them. That means we will have to stand up to powerful special interests. In so doing, we can bring about a fairer and simpler tax system.

If this is what Congress has in mind when it talks about tax reform, count me in.

If tax reform is defined by what we have seen thus far, count me out.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a description of the successful tax reform effort in my State of Wisconsin which appeared in a recent issue of people and taxes. I believe Congress can learn from this example of progressive tax reform.

WISCONSIN PIONEERS TAX REFORM

(By Diane Sherwood and Kristin Franklin)

"As Maine goes, so goes the nation" is a popular election-year truism. But where taxes are concerned, Wisconsin seems to be the state to watch—it's the state that first established a state personal income tax, workman's compensation, and an unemployment tax. Now Wisconsin has passed a landmark tax simplification measure that one scribe calls "the income tax development of the year . . . [whose] positive significance . . . shows the political feasibility of tax reforms."

The new Wisconsin tax system, finalized in July, does what many federal reformers can only dream of—it eliminates many tax deductions, reduces the number of tax brackets from eight to four, and lowers marginal rates. It also cuts taxes for six out of every ten Wisconsin taxpayers.

"We're excited about the tax reform," raves Michael Vlasisavljevich, Research Director for the Wisconsin Revenue Department. "And I think that as word gets out, there will be increasing interest because right now it is the major example of genuine tax reform that has already been enacted."

GOOD-BYE WISCONSIN

Impetus for Wisconsin's personal income tax reform came from a good news-bad news situation facing the state. It began when Kimberly Clark, a prominent Wisconsin-based corporation, informed Democratic Gov. Anthony Earl that the firm was considering leaving the state. Such glum news sounded painfully familiar—Wisconsin has lost more corporate headquarters than any other state in the nation, according to a state study. "Old Milwaukee beer isn't even from Milwaukee anymore," one state official laments. The good news was that Wisconsin had mopped up its budget deficit and was sitting on a \$500 million budget surplus.

Gov. Earl created the Wisconsin Strategic Development Commission, composed of private and public sector citizens, whose mandate was to determine how Wisconsin could enhance its business climate. Half of the commission's \$500,000 came from the private sector. One of the group's major findings was that Wisconsin had lost an estimated 134,000 jobs since 1979.

Yankelovich, Skelly & White, a national public opinion research firm headquartered in New York, conducted a key study which concluded that high personal state income taxes were "a major irritant" to business executives, particularly those in high income brackets, according to Fred Shaffer, legislative counsel for the Wisconsin Association of Business and Manufacturers. Wisconsin's top personal tax rate of 10 percent was one of the highest in the nation. When combined with other state and local taxes, Wisconsin residents in 1983 bore the sixth heaviest tax burden in the country, according to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

"The whole thrust was that we needed tax reductions," says Sue Engeleiter, Republican Minority Leader in the Wisconsin state Senate. Engeleiter and her fellow-Republicans were skeptical about tax reform from start to finish. "Nobody was particularly interested in tax reform. People wanted tax reductions. It was the governor, and just about only the governor, whose agenda was reform," she says.

Earl's original reform proposal boldly called for only three tax brackets and elimination of deductions for interest, including home mortgage interest, charitable donations, medical expenses and political contributions. The package was "99.44 percent pure" and a "radical beginning" when it was introduced, and became "maybe a fraction less pure" as it maneuvered through the political process, a spokesman for the governor boasts.

"It wasn't well-received even by people in his own party," recalls Engeleiter, the Senate Republican leader. Wisconsin legislators forced Earl to restore write-offs for medical expenses, home interest payments, charitable contributions, and other interest payments up to \$1,200.

But in a novel twist—the first of its kind in the nation, according to Wisconsin legislators—the write-offs for personal expenses will be limited to a 5 percent tax credit. For example, a taxpayer earning \$30,000 will receive an automatic standard deduction of \$2,400. If personal write-offs exceed \$2,400, the taxpayer will be allowed to multiply the difference (personal write-offs minus standard deduction) by 5 percent, and add that figure to the standard deduction.

"I like the idea of a credit better than a deduction," explains the man who proposed the idea, Assemblyman Dismas Becker. Becker is a Democrat from Milwaukee's inner city. "This tax credit plan would definitely work on the federal level."

State Republicans, in contrast, disparage the credit as "screw." It "is going to make accountants rub their heads and say, 'What's going on in Wisconsin?'" Engeleiter complains.

Wisconsin's four new tax rates will range from 5 percent to 7.9 percent, with intermediate brackets of 6.6 percent and 7.5 percent. A sliding scale standard deduction will range from \$7,200 for a low-income married couple to no deduction for a single person earning more than \$77,500. During negotiations, Republicans say they supported the sliding scale standard deduction only as a way "to bring down the top rates."

WISCONSIN'S TAX BURDEN

State-local tax revenue as percent of personal income

1. New York	15.3
2. District of Columbia	14.4
3. Minnesota	13.2
4. WISCONSIN	13.1

5. Hawaii.....	12.8
6. Montana.....	12.5
7. Michigan.....	12.4
8. Vermont.....	12.1

Note: Does not include Alaska and Wyoming, which receive large revenues from oil and severance taxes.

DISPUTED CUTS

Initial estimates claim that the largest tax cuts—average reductions of 23 percent—will go to those earning \$5,000–\$10,000 and to those earning more than \$300,000. All other income brackets will receive an average tax cut of 5.6 percent to 15.7 percent. Total tax cuts will equal \$171 million.

The measure squeaked past the Assembly in a virtual party-line vote, 52–47. The Senate then adopted the tax reform 21–12 in another partisan split. Mike Youngman, assistant to the Democratic Speaker of the Assembly, charges that Democrats worked hard to make the reform proposal bipartisan by increasing Republicans' membership on the tax-writing committees. Youngman complains that Republicans withheld their support in an unsuccessful effort to show voters that Democrats could not "take control."

Republican officials claim that tax reductions should have taken priority over tax reform, and that the tax reduction is inadequate. They point out that 40 percent of the state's residents will receive no income tax cut, and 287,000 filers—particularly those in higher brackets who will lose some deductions—will probably experience a tax increase.

"It clobbers the (corporate) decision-makers, people who make the decisions to move companies," Engeleiter warns. "The biggest segment hit will be two-wage earner middle-income families. There's no justification for anybody to pay more when you have a \$500 million budget surplus."

"Tax simplification creates winners and losers," acknowledges Shaffer, of the Business and Manufacturing Association. "There is no telling if any given person in any given bracket will be a winner or loser . . . The benefit of simplicity must be weighed against the different impacts that occur within the same income group. It (the tax bill) will be beneficial for lots of people, but it is difficult to guarantee that any given individual will benefit."

Gov. Earl, meanwhile, speaks of Wisconsin's tax reform as an epic event. "It is the most far-reaching tax reform since our state pioneered progressive income tax in 1911," he says. "This reform makes taxes not only lower but simpler and fair. It restores progressivity and integrity; it makes the way we finance government not only more progressive, but more faithful to our tradition and the expectations of our citizens."

Tax reform in Wisconsin was driven in part by a desire to simplify the state's income tax system, lower the top rates, and make the system more fair—concerns that are repeated on the federal level, points out Rindert Kiemel of the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance. The trail blazed by Wisconsin also offers innovative tax ideas for federal reformers, such as converting deductions to tax credits, and the sliding scale standard deduction. The state has a proud history of pioneering ideas that are later used on a national level.

Is the Wisconsin experience a harbinger of national tax reform? Unhappily for federal tax reformers, the national debate is not entirely analogous to Wisconsin's. Unlike Wisconsin, Congress can only hope to pass tax reform legislation on a biparti-

san basis. Federal reform will likely fail if it degenerates into partisan politics. Nor can the federal government afford to lose more revenues, point out William Bechtel, director of Wisconsin's Office of State-Federal Relations.

Acknowledges Bechtel, "It is easier to pass a tax reform bill which reduces taxes, rather than to pass one which is revenue neutral."

RECOMMENDATIONS OF DEMOCRATIC TASK FORCE ON TRADE

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in Boston last Tuesday and Wednesday the Democratic Task Force on Trade heard from more than 20 witnesses from business, management, and academia in the New England regional hearing on trade. We learned from each of these groups the sad story that America is no longer competitive in the international markets and that our markets are being flooded by cheap imports, which in effect is causing a deindustrialization of our country.

Later in the week the Task Force on Trade, led by the chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER], submitted an alternative trade policy for our country to make us competitive again. It deals with seven points: The inflated dollar, export financing, economic adjustment, export controls, farm exports, natural resource subsidies, and foreign industrial targeting.

I commend the work of the Trade Task Force and of the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER], and urge my colleagues to give serious study to this proposal in order to make America competitive again in international markets.

DEMOCRATIC TASK FORCE ON TRADE PROPOSAL VERSUS REAGAN PLAN

	Democratic task force plan	Reagan plan
1. The inflated dollar.....	Convening of an international monetary conference as a prerequisite for a new round of GATT talks. Expanded and coordinated intervention to bring the dollar down to a level consistent with current account balance. Establishment of a strategic capital reserve.	Limited intervention to promote stability. [For the past 4 years the Reagan administration has hailed the inflated dollar as a sign of American strength.]

DEMOCRATIC TASK FORCE ON TRADE PROPOSAL VERSUS REAGAN PLAN—Continued

	Democratic task force plan	Reagan plan
2. Export financing.....	\$500 million for a mixed credit program within Eximbank and AID. \$1.8 billion for Eximbank direct lending in fiscal year 1986 and more in the future.	\$300 million for mixed credits within the Treasury Department. [The administration had consistently opposed mixed credits and earlier this year called for the elimination of Eximbank direct lending.]
3. Economic adjustment....	Long-term reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance, with financing through a nominal import fee. Expanding of TAA retraining benefits and eligibility criteria. Establishment of a national computerized job bank. Establishment of a permanent Council on Industrial Competitiveness. Development of industry and community adjustment plans in conjunction with temporary import relief under section 201.	A study by the Secretary of Labor on how to improve Trade Adjustment Assistance. [The administration has consistently supported elimination of the program.]
4. Export controls.....	Stringent limitations on Defense Department involvement in export licensing. Strict adherence to foreign availability standards of the revised Export Administration Act. Narrow interpretation of contract sanctity provision of the Export Administration Act.	[The administration has significantly expanded the scope of export restrictions, adding unnecessary and costly burdens to America's exporters.]
5. Farm exports.....	\$5 billion for export guarantees, with origination fees no greater than one-third of 1 percent. \$325 million for Export Credit Program. \$500 million set-aside within the Intermediate Credit Program for exports. Reauthorization of the Export Credit Revolving Fund. An expanded and fully competitive Export Enhancement Program.	[The administration has proposed terminating the Export Credit Program and imposing a prohibitive origination fee for export guarantees. The administration has shackled its own BICEP Program with restrictive criteria.]
6. Natural resources subsidies.	Inclusion of natural resource subsidies within the countervailing duty law.	
7. Foreign industrial targeting.	Inclusion of foreign industrial targeting within the reciprocity law (section 301).	

THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today in Arizona, our Government begins its prosecution of 12 church workers who are charged with providing sanctuary to Salvadoran refugees. There has been very little publicity on this case considering its tremendous impact on the 500,000 Salvadoran refugees and the thousands of American church workers in the United States because the trial judge imposed a gag order on

the defendants this past summer. But there are some serious questions about the Government's activities in this case that ought to be considered very carefully.

In order to gather the evidence against the church workers, the Government sent undercover agents into churches to pose as religious congregants and supporters of the sanctuary movement. These false parishioners needed no prior clearance with a magistrate before infiltrating the church. They never approached a neutral judge with justification for their proposed undercover operation—and they didn't have to. Under the law, undercover operations need prior judicial approval only when they involve wiretapping or electronic surveillance. This leaves the infiltration of activities—such as church meetings—completely at the discretion of the police.

Our Government was formed as a triumvirate—a system of checks and balances. In the Arizona sanctuary case, there were no checks and balances because, under the law, the Justice Department could act on its own without the usual protections afforded by having an impartial third party consider the propriety of its actions.

It sets a dangerous precedent to allow law enforcement agencies to act without restraint. If our law enforcement agencies are allowed to continue to act unilaterally and without exercising reasonable discretion, our freedom is jeopardized. The Arizona case is exemplary, and we should all be concerned that the outcome of the trial reflect a return to the basic tenets on which our most fair system or government was founded.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Washington Post by Nat Hentoff:

UNDERCOVER AGENTS GO TO CHURCH

Although the use of undercover agents has become as American as light beer, until now no government agency has admitted to planting them in a church. In trying to make a case against sanctuary workers in Arizona, however, the U.S. government conducted a 10-month undercover investigation, Operation Sojourner, which led to the indictment of 16 people (later reduced to 12). The charges include bringing undocumented aliens illegally into the United States and then concealing them.

The government's case is based on about 100 covert tape recordings, many of them made in church, by two paid government informants, who had disguised themselves as ardently religious supporters of the refugees. Among the tapes are Bible study classes and prayer services.

During recent pretrial hearings in Phoenix, U.S. District Judge Earl Carroll has not appeared particularly impressed with defense arguments based on the state of human rights in Central America or the notion that international law can transcend American immigration rules. Judge Carroll has, however, been disturbed by testimony about the government's creation of a new frontier for undercover agents. Sending "people paid to do it and wired to do it into

places of religious activity," the judge said, means "the whole process has been sullied in a sense."

An argument is being made by lawyers for the American Civil Liberties Union and the Center for Constitutional Rights, among other attorneys involved in the case, that all the "sullied" evidence obtained by the false congregants should be thrown out.

The question, they say, is not whether the government can never send an informant into a church. Crimes can be flaunted in holy places, as is richly evident in the histories of England and Russia. But in this country, can covert agents constitutionally be sent into a church without first going before a neutral magistrate—a judge who hears the government's probable cause for planting the informants and then decides whether the government has shown compelling, specific reason to compromise the holy place?

As it is now, no undercover agent, whether he slips into a church or a congressman's office, needs a warrant. Responsible for this largest hole in the ever more tattered fabric of the Fourth Amendment is the Supreme Court, which has never understood that a covert informant is far more intrusive than a wiretap or bug.

The constitutional significance of the sanctuary workers' case is that it may finally produce some warrant requirement for undercover operatives, at least in a church setting. At issue and at risk are First Amendment protections for free exercise of religion and, within that context, for freedom of speech and association. The informants, it should be kept in mind, did not tape only meetings in which those "conspiring" to smuggle aliens were present. They picked up the conversations of a lot of other church members. Yet, only the government handlers of the government informants decided what was to be taped and when. No detached magistrate was supervising Operation Sojourner.

The defense maintains that the warrant clause of the Fourth Amendment must be invoked whenever the government intends to use undercover informants in ways that may threaten significant First Amendment values. Like sending them into a church to pick up anything they can.

During the pretrial hearings in Phoenix, Pastor Eugene Lefebvre of the Sunrise Presbyterian Church testified that a woman who took part in a church discussion that was later found to have been surreptitiously taped is now afraid that the FBI has opened a file on her and that she could be targeted when she applies for a teaching position.

And James Oines, pastor of Alzona Lutheran Church, said from the stand that he no longer holds Bible study classes because some members of his congregation are afraid to come to the church. They no longer have faith that the person sitting next to them is revealing his true heart.

Oines added: "The deepest aspect of their faith and trust was violated. It turned out that we were as gentle as doves but not so wise as serpents."

Among the defendants are a Protestant minister, Roman Catholic priests and nuns, a social worker, a college student and a Quaker rancher. The lawyer for one of them, James Brosnahan, told the National Catholic Reporter that "the government has not made a practice of invading church buildings to apprehend people. I would like to think of it as an aberration that will never happen again."

It all depends on what the courts say. This, after all, is an administration con-

vinced that God, being on its side, would not consider an undercover agent to be trespassing in one of His churches under these circumstances.

A PROPOSAL TO STAGGER TAX RETURN FILING DATES BASED ON A TAXPAYER'S BIRTHDAY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that Halloween of 1985 began on April 15, when the horror stories began to emanate from the taxpayers of the country on the mismanagement of their returns, or nonmanagement of their returns by the IRS in the various regional offices.

Particularly in my section of the country, where the Philadelphia office has been undergoing tremendous problems, they indicate, with their new computer setup. We have been besieged in every district office with hundreds of complaints and shrieks of horror, as it were, on what has been happening to individual taxpayers.

We have had hospitals receive notification that accounts are frozen, and that their assets are to be subjects of liens and other legal actions by the IRS, all to the shock of the managers of that hospital; it has happened more than one time.

There is no excuse for that kind of thing occurring, and we cannot place the blame totally on the fact of computer goblins or gremlins or Halloween ghosts or monsters. The chief cause in the estimation of many for the recurring problems that our taxpayers have been facing has been the crush of filing because of the deadline, the artificial, arbitrary deadline that has been with us so long, of April 15.

I have proposed to the Committee on Ways and Means, and have received some favorable comment already from members thereof, that they consider through the tax simplification process that they are now pursuing, that they consider spreading out, throughout the entire calendar year, the filing date for our taxpayers through their birthdates.

In other words, no longer, if my plan should be accomplished, would we all have to file by April the 15th, but rather to file our returns based on our individual birthdates, the month of our birth dates.

Now I yield to the Speaker pro tempore to let me know what month he celebrates his birthday in?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. April 2.

Mr. GEKAS. You have ruined my whole example. My birthday is April 14, so I have the same difficulty.

Now, I happen to know that the lady at the clerk's desk, Mrs. Topper, celebrates her birthday on May 29. Under my system, she would not have to file her income tax return until May 30 of every calendar year.

Now this is the way it would work: If she had a refund coming, she could file the moment she received her W-2, just as she can do now, but she would not have to file by April 15, but rather the last day of the month of May for her particular case. So if she owes money, she would not have to pay until that month.

Now for the first year that this goes into practice, she has received 1 month's grace period, but ordinarily she could get an extension from the IRS anyway to file her tax return, so that is no big deal.

So if every taxpayer after April 15, the first 4 months, we will all have to file between January 1 and April 30. Under this staggered system, that would relieve the IRS of a gigantic crush; would relieve each taxpayer of the necessity of having to line up on April 15, at some post office to file a tax return and thus, we would have an orderly system that would prevent the chaos that is now occurring.

Some people would say, "Well, what happens to a joint return, what if we have two birthdays in a joint return?" There there would have to be an election made as to which birthday would be preferable to the couple filing the tax return. Thus we would have a very simple system, and effective system, spreading out the IRS impact for a full year.

There is ample precedent, by the way, in the States and the District of Columbia, as I understand it, in the registration fees for automobiles. In Pennsylvania no longer do we have the lineups for the artificial deadline for getting a registration; it goes by birth date; and it has worked handsomely. I understand the same system works in the Washington, DC, area. So we have some precedent for doing so.

This would not change the W-2 system at all; the employers would not have to know the birth date of their employees and give them a W-2 that is comparable to that particular birth date; they would continue with the present system; it is simply that the taxpayer would hold the W-2 until the month of his or her birth date.

We have got to do something. I will not tolerate an answer by IRS that this cannot work, that they cannot put it in their computer. With all the other computer problems they have, I am willing to risk another computer problem to straighten the mess out.

I urge the Members of the House to consider strongly contacting members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask them to fully consider this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 359, on October 16, 1985. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the motion to approve the House Journal.

□ 1520

WE NEED MORE TIME TO ANALYZE THE RELATIONS IN THE WAKE OF THE "ACHILLE LAURO"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LOWRY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not come to the special order with any prepared text, or certainly I am lacking very much in knowledge of the subject that concerns me which has been that many of the statements on this floor and within the media in our country ever since the action taken against the four terrorist hijackers of the Italian ship, what I am specifically referring to are statements made against our strong allies or our valued allies, outstanding allies, specifically, the President of Egypt, Mr. Mubarak, whom I have observed to be a thoughtful world leader, and I think we all realize he is a valuable ally of the United States.

Well, I have also realized that the Egyptian-Israeli Camp David accords are one of the most important foreign policy questions, objectives, and progress that has been made in one of the most difficult regions of the world in many, many years.

While I am seeking more information as to specifics of what went on in the negotiations relative to the action taken of forcing down the Egyptian commercial airliner, as to what was known by the leadership of Israel, Egypt, or anybody else, I want to make it clear that I do not know, I do not know. I am looking forward to finding out more. But I really hope that as we discuss this extremely difficult question of terrorism on which we are all united, as against those coward terrorists, and we are all united in having the right action taken against terrorists, I have never met a thinking human being who does not want to do that, I want to also be very cognizant

of how important it is that we work with our allies in doing that. Again, in saying that, I am not saying that we did it in this instance, but as I read more and more accounts and as I watched the President of Egypt on, I believe, television on Sunday, and the strength of the statements, and the way he was saying it, I am concerned, and I hope that we are all dedicated toward maintaining a strong alliance with the people of Egypt, a strong commitment, continuing commitment, toward the hopes of the Camp David-Israeli-Egyptian accords and also a strong realization of how important Italy is to us as one of our important NATO allies.

I think we are in agreement on that. I just wanted to make that statement and hope that we are all thinking in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE LESSONS OF GRENADA—UPDATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, in one captured message, Marshal Ogarkov, then head of the Soviet military, said:

Nineteen years ago we had only Cuba; today we have Cuba, Nicaragua, and Grenada, and the battlefield is El Salvador. We are making progress.

This week we celebrate the "Lessons of Grenada Week." I would like to commend my colleagues, Representatives NEWT GINGRICH and IKE SKELTON, for introducing a resolution, House Resolution 313, to authorize the President to proclaim the week of October 20, 1985, "The Lessons of Grenada Week."

Grenada is an awfully important place. No, it is not important because it is one of the larger countries in our hemisphere; it is not because it is one of the most economically powerful countries in our hemisphere; it is not important because it has a very large population. No, Grenada is important because Grenada is a symbol.

What does Grenada symbolize? I have here a synopsis of documents. The overall number of documents reaches from the floor to the ceiling and comprised thousands upon thousands of pieces of paper. This synopsis of documents, called "The Grenada Documents, an Overview and Selection," underpins the symbolism of Grenada for all the world to see.

Grenada was the location where the Soviet Union and where the Cubans sought to develop a Marxist-Leninist government. What we have in these Grenada documents are the details of how this process occurred. What we

have are documents in Russian, what we have are documents in Korean, what we have are documents in the languages of the Soviet international fighting force, that state the reality of what was happening in Grenada for those years during the Bishop leadership, up until the date of liberation.

Grenada is important to the American people because it points out how, in detail, the Communist government, supported by the Soviet Union, using the Cubans as surrogates, come to power and then sought to extend their influence elsewhere.

I had the pleasure, or should I say the intriguing experience, of traveling to Grenada with a group of Congressmen directly after the liberation.

While in Fort Frederick, which is where Bishop and some of his supporters were brutally murdered by the usurping Coard faction, I had the opportunity to come across some documents of my own. Our own intelligence services had barely been through this location and the various countries involved in the liberation had barely cleaned up the floors. This document that I have, which is a diary, I believe says a great deal about what was going on in Grenada. Let me just quote from a few of these pages. On one page of the diary, which also has the budget of its owner in there, the monthly budget of its owner, who, I might add, turned out to be a member of the Central Committee, Mr. Liam James. One of the line item entries in this budget is his stipend. This stipend comes from the Soviet Union. This gentleman was being paid \$650 a month from the Soviet Union. That is in his line of income as opposed to his line of expenses. He had his taxes, which were \$100; he had his party dues, which were \$50; he had his credit union costs, which were \$50; he had his bank payments, which were \$500; and then he had the Soviet Union at \$650.

Throughout this diary are references to his interactions with the Cuban Ambassador, which the Soviet Ambassador, with trips to the Soviet Union, with banks, and bank account numbers in New York City.

I recommend for anyone who is really interested in what happened in Grenada to go through this diary and see the influence of the Cuban colonels and the Vietnamese and the North Koreans and the Soviets on this Bishop government.

The lessons of Grenada are awfully important for the American people when it comes to the current debate over Nicaragua. There is a great deal of difference of opinion over what is going on in Nicaragua. I submit, if anyone goes through the Grenada documents even cursorily, their views of what is happening in Nicaragua would change markedly.

We had an opportunity to travel to Nicaragua not long ago, and I went with a fellow Congressman, Congressman Brown of California. We met with the leadership of all the different countries in the region, and I can tell you the leadership of these countries in the region, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, understand the lessons of Grenada. Their views of the Government in Nicaragua were eminently clear. We had an opportunity to meet with the Nicaraguan leadership as well. We met with Daniel Ortega, we met with Thomas Borge, in a wide-ranging discussion with Thomas Borge. It was obvious that his background was one of a strong Marxist-Leninist, that he was, as the major figure in the revolution, committed to a Marxist-Leninist state; that his involvement with the Soviet Union and with the Vietnamese and with the Cubans was powerful and that what we see in Nicaragua is essentially a rerun of what had happened in Grenada.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding because he is mentioning the parallels between the situation in Grenada, Cuba, and some of the other parts of the world. I wonder if the gentleman would reflect upon the conversation that he was recently involved in, where I was there too, with the President of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, in which he also defined just how closely some of these things are tied together? We know from the Grenada documents there was direct Soviet involvement in Grenada; from some of the Grenada documents we know, for example, that the Soviet military was in regular communication with the Grenadan Government. We know about Soviet involvement in Cuba. We know about Soviet involvement in Angola. The gentleman in this meeting posed a very interesting question of the President of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko. He asked him about the Sovietization of Central America. I wonder if the gentleman might reflect for a moment as to what the very interesting answer of the President of the Soviet Union was.

□ 1535

Mr. RITTER. Yes; we discussed human rights conditions and what we felt was the re-Stalinization occurring in the Soviet Union. We discussed the invasion of Afghanistan and the decimation of an entire population, and we brought up the Sovietization of Nicaragua, specifically.

The President of the Soviet Union, Andrei Gromyko's, response to this comment was that he pitied us because he felt we were victims of a cam-

paign of disinformation, which was running apace in our Western media.

So he took the human rights violations, the fact that I mentioned that five Ukrainian human rights activists alone, Helsinki monitors, some of whom were in their thirties and forties, have died within the last 1½ years in Soviet prisons and camps, and he took Afghanistan, and the Sovietization of Nicaragua as a disinformation campaign. He added on to that—and this is where the gentleman's comment is very relevant—he added on to that, "We have heard the same stories, the same disinformation, about our activities"—Soviet activities—"Cuba and Soviet activities in Angola, and it is the same disinformation."

In other words, the President of the Soviet Union stated that essentially what they were doing in Nicaragua, what they were doing in Cuba, and what they were doing in Angola, was essentially the same. It is all disinformation.

Mr. WALKER. I think this is an important point, if the gentleman will yield again. It was certainly my impression, based upon what we were told by the President in that meeting just a matter of a few days ago, that what he was telling us was that "We are no more involved in Nicaragua than we are in Cuba or Angola," and for those in this country who have been supporting the Sandinista government and who have been suggesting that there is no real problem down in Central America, no real problem in Nicaragua, I think they ought to reflect upon that statement, because it was certainly clear to me, in the course of that conversation, that he was saying, well, you know, it is just all lies, it is lied about that we are involved in Cuba. Well, they only have submarine bases there, they are only providing a large portion of the GNP of that country, they are only doing major things there. In Angola, they are only supplying the army with a great deal of weaponry, they only have Cuban troops based in the country. I mean there is direct involvement. It is not disinformation to suggest that they are there in large numbers, and he is saying, "We are no more involved there or in Nicaragua than we are in Cuba and in Angola." That is a pretty devastating admission when you think of the implications of it.

Mr. RITTER. Yes, it is. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I accompanied the gentleman on our trip to Grenada a couple years ago, a little over a year ago, when the liberation took place. The previous

speaker alluded to a lot of the disinformation that the Soviets say is just that, disinformation, when, in fact, we have factual information that proves that they just continue to lie one day after another.

In Grenada, the gentleman will recall that we saw thousands of AK-47 machineguns and 4 or 5 million rounds of ammunition that came from the Soviet Union in 2 buildings, and we saw secret documents that pledged 15 million rubles in direct military aid to the Grenadian Communist Party, and \$10 million in aid from the Korean Communist Party to Grenada to outfit 12,000 troops on that island that was 8 miles wide by 18 miles long, about half the size of most urban areas in the United States of America.

So the Communists, supported by the Soviets, directly supported by the Soviets, were subverting not only the people of Grenada but hoping to use that to launch further military adventurism in Central and South America.

In Nicaragua, we know that last year the Soviets sent 18,000 tons of war materials into that country, 68,000 tons into Cuba, and they sent over \$1 billion into countries like Mozambique and Angola.

So when Mr. Gromyko says that is disinformation that the United States is putting out, we know what we are talking about. We know that he is the liar.

Mr. RITTER. If the gentleman will yield back for a moment, he did not even say that it was disinformation that the United States is putting out. He said it was disinformation from our media and that these stories were simply petty accounts. He was not even blaming the Government. I suppose he was blaming the New York Times, the Washington Post, UPI, AP, and essentially the fourth estate of the United States for disinformation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, that is kind of like the pot calling the kettle black. In Nicaragua, for instance, we found out on the Foreign Affairs Committee that they were involved in a massive disinformation plot here in the United States not long ago, and it was supported by the Soviet Union.

There is a law firm here in Washington, DC called Reichler & Appelbaum, who has received over \$300,000 in retainers from the Communist government of Nicaragua last year, and this law firm in Washington decided they had to make the Communist Sandinistas look better in the eyes of the American people, to get Congress off their backs. So this law firm sent a team of people down there to do a human rights study that would favor the Communists. Their airfare was paid for by the Communists, their lodging was paid for by the Communists, their transportation down there and food and everything was paid for

by the Communists. And, obviously, when they came back they had written a report that was favorable to the Communist Sandinista government saying that they were the good guys and the freedom fighters were animals. After that, they sent a second team down to verify what the first team came up with in the form of this report purely for the reason to distance themselves from this report because they had received this huge retainer from the Communist Sandinista government. Well, they came back to Washington, and the Washington Office on Latin America, a liberal think tank, wrote this report up, and three U.S. Congressmen met with these people and they had a big press conference, and at this press conference they pointed out that this report, paid for lock, stock, and barrel by the Communists, said that the human rights atrocities taking place in Nicaragua were primarily being caused and perpetrated by the freedom fighters down there instead of the Communist dictators.

Well, that night on all the major networks, everybody in America saw that the freedom fighters were the bad guys and the Communists were the good guys, and it was all paid for by the Communists. It was pure Communist disinformation. So when the Communists tell us that we are involved in a disinformation scam, if you please, we should make sure that the American people know it is just the opposite, that the Communists are buying information in this country through the media.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, I will point out something that the gentleman from Indiana might be interested in. I don't know if he saw the interview on this morning's network by Phil Donahue of the Communist dictator of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega, but he may be pleased to know, having cited all of the amounts of arms that the Soviet Union has poured into Nicaragua, that when that question was raised on the Phil Donahue show, Daniel Ortega's response to that was, well, he would be glad to take weapons from the United States too.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am sure he would.

Mr. RITTER. What is interesting about the Grenada documents is how in detail the development of this satellite state came about. I have before me just one of the 35,000 pounds of hidden secret documents. It is entitled, "Protocol."

(Mr. RITTER proceeded to make the following remarks in Russian:)

Protocol to the Agreement between the Government of Grenada and the Government of the U.S.S.R. of October 27, 1980—

I am reading this in Russian simply for effect, obviously. But it says something about the Sovietization. These

documents are in English. These documents are in Russian. And these documents weigh thousands of pounds.

Now, I think what we find here, with Gromyko's response to seven American Congressmen, characterizing what we know to be the Sovietization of Nicaragua as disinformation and then equating it with Cuba and Angola, a kind of denial response of which the American people have to be very wary.

We saw that in Paris, when Gorbachev answered the French journalist's request on information on political prisoners and human rights violations. Gorbachev's response was to deny the whole thing by attacking the character of the French journalist.

Now, in order to understand what is happening in our Hemisphere, in order to understand what is happening in Nicaragua, in the face of a monumental campaign of denial and disinformation on the part of our adversaries, the Grenada documents and the lessons of Grenada assume far, far greater importance.

The peace talks, the arms talks that will take place between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan, take place within this framework of a Sovietization of a Western Hemispheric country. We unearthed a model of the Sovietization which is occurring today in another Western Hemispheric nation. It is important that the people of the United States have some familiarity with the depth of the relationship between the Soviet Union, and their military, between the previous Grenada Government and their military, and between the Nicaraguan Government and their military.

Recently, it was said by the Nicaraguan Government, by Daniel Ortega, that they curtailed human rights and civil rights inside Nicaragua because of American support for democrats, small "d" democrats, fighting for freedom inside Nicaragua. At the same time, reports have reached this country that the military pressure the Sandinistas have been putting against these democratic forces has been reasonably successful, and that indeed, to some extent, the Sandinista-Soviet-Cuba-supported forces have gained somewhat the upper hand.

So here the Nicaraguan Government is reducing drastically the remaining vestiges of civil and human rights inside Nicaragua at a time when militarily they are gaining the upper hand over the Contras.

What Grenada shows, what the model shows, is that these individuals are not averse to telling untruths, are not averse to calling black white and white black, as evidenced by the recent performance before seven Congressmen branding human rights violations and the invasion of Afghanistan as disinformation. The American people have got to understand that

when they watch Daniel Ortega on the Donahue show not everything is altogether objective and open.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman for making this prediction of what was going to happen in Nicaragua a long time ago. I do not know of any more perceptive Member than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on this particular issue, and I want to say thanks for taking this time for this special order.

The gentleman predicted this a long time ago. Susan Sontag said something about this, too, in one of her famous speeches, where she said that it seems that the conservatives are much better at predicting what is going to happen in a totalitarian society than the liberals are.

But I think that we have an obligation here in this respect—in that here we have an individual and a country that we debated for hours and hours, days on end, on this very floor, and when there is repression, when there is denial of human rights, you hear nothing from the other side. Where are all the apologists for this regime, not only here on this floor but also in the media?

I just want to make one more comment, and that is that we conservatives are not winning because we do not get our story across. What the gentleman is doing with the special order, in this way, is trying to get the story across, and I compliment the gentleman for doing that. I wish we had more people doing that. But we are losing the war of words, and that is where the next battle, the next war is going to be won or lost.

I compliment the gentleman again for taking the initiative on this special order.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, during the Vietnam war, the South and the North were locked in mortal combat and the North had the Soviets on their side and at that time the Chinese, and the South had the United States on its side. This was a major war, not some Contra group off in the hills somewhere, these were main-force North Vietnamese units attacking a country, South Vietnam. At that time you could hear just loads and tons of comments on the floor any time there was a human or civil rights violation on the part of the South Vietnamese Government in the midst of a major war.

□ 1550

That was here in Washington, DC; here in this Congress.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding; I know we have only so much time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the issue that we are facing here today of what is taking place in Nicaragua, because I do not think we want to lose the focal point. I think we want to take a look at that issue and spend just a little time on it. Again, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, to me, it is an outrage that the Nicaraguan ruler, Ortega, who represses every form of freedom of expression within his own society will come here to the United Nations and berate the policies of civilized governments including our own. The stench of hypocrisy hangs so heavily that even its most ardent apologists, both in this body and in the national media, I think should be ashamed of themselves.

Where is the outrage? Where is the press coverage? Where are the liberals in this body who constantly lecture about human rights and fledgling democracies like El Salvador? Where are they? Mr. WALKER, where are they?

I am particularly horrified by the recent clampdown that has taken place as far as the church is concerned in Nicaragua. It is bad enough that the thugs from that regime have publicly humiliated priests time and again who have refused to accept the Sandinista-controlled "People's Church." It is even worse that Nicaraguan faithful to the traditional church are being beaten and jailed, incidentally, without due process of law.

How can this be? The church clearly sided with the revolution that brought the Sandinistas to power. Perhaps Mr. Ortega's apologists would like to blame the U.S. Government for the increased repression. I think they should wake up and confront reality. That is why I think this speech of Susan Sontag, and I am going to ask that that be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be read by every Member of this body, because here is a person on the other side of the aisle, a liberal, who says, "Hey, we are not being realistic and these are the reasons why." Here are the reasons why the conservatives are so much more accurate in determining and predicting what is going to happen in a totalitarian, especially a Communist society. I think that that should be an awakening to us all.

Mr. RITTER. During the era of Maurice Bishop in Grenada there was a wide body of support for Mr. Bishop here in this Congress and within certain aspects, sectors, of American intellectual thought. Mr. Bishop is a charismatic figure, by the way. They are all charismatic figures; Daniel

Ortega is a charismatic figure; Fidel Castro is a charismatic figure; Gromyko is a charismatic figure. But simply because somebody is attractive and well-spoken and has a nice personality and a capability personality does not mean that what they stand for is anything that we should be standing for.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I do not know if they are all charismatic figures; I personally do not think so. Anyhow, I want to make this comment about the church in Nicaragua because I think it is important.

The church is under attack because the bishops there have called for peace and reconciliation among all segments of society, and is that not what we have always done as far as El Salvador and all the other countries that we are concerned about? Yet, the regime sends the armed mobs to disrupt services, destroy church property and beat up the people who are worshipping.

The moral authority that the church enjoys among the general population has forced this regime to bend to total power to expel many priests from their own country. As a spectacle, the repression that takes place there, I think its going to be harder and harder to ignore. I hope that those on the other side of this issue will join us in pressuring the regime to stop the persecution that is taking place. After all, I do not think we would acquiesce to that in any country in the world, especially in a country like Nicaragua.

So if we are looking for evenhandedness, we are looking for a dual policy, I think this is precisely the time for us to speak out and ask for that. I thank the gentleman again for being so gracious with his time.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contributions. The lessons of Grenada are particularly important today as we witness a dynamic situation in Nicaragua, a situation where the President of Nicaragua, the so-called President of Nicaragua, is here propagandizing in our country much in the same way that Maurice Bishop did when he was top leader in Grenada.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the repression that existed in Grenada when the Communists took over under Maurice Bishop and the repression that is taking place in Nicaragua today and in Vietnam and elsewhere, one thing that really ought to be brought to the attention of the American people is what they are doing to the minds of the very young.

The first thing the Communists do when they take over a country is bring in teachers to make sure that they indoctrinate the children in revolutionary tactics and Communist dogma.

In Vietnam for instance, General Weyand, our last commanding general, was asked this question: "Why did the Communists keep coming when they lost over 1 million men?" The United States lost about 55,000 men, the South Vietnamese lost about 55,000 men, but the Communist Vietnamese lost over 1 million and they kept coming. He was asked why that occurred.

He said, "In my opinion, I found something in a North Vietnamese Communist textbook that gives me a clue, and that was early ideological indoctrination. If four Imperialist warmongers appeared and two were killed, how many would be left?" They taught children to add, subtract, multiply and divide by using revolutionary examples. Murdering people.

Now, in Nicaragua today, you and I have been down there in recent months, when I was in Nicaragua I was able to get a Communist Nicaraguan first grade mathematics book. If you look at that book you will find that they are adding by 3 AK-47 machineguns plus 3 AK-47 machineguns or how many machineguns. Two handgrenades plus two handgrenades are how many handgrenades. That is just in the first grade. They are indoctrinating these children in our hemisphere to be zealots like they were in Vietnam. If we are not aware of what went on in Grenada and what is going on in Nicaragua today, our children very likely will have to face these children on the battlefield at some future date, and nobody wants that.

We need to be aware of what happened in Grenada and what is going on in Nicaragua right now and make sure that we stop it.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

There are some 250 to 300 college campuses which will be dealing with the lessons of Grenada this week. There are some 50 high schools which will be dealing with this subject. As we try to meet the propaganda offensive of Gorbachev and this new relationship between Gorbachev and the media, we have no greater intellectual resource at our fingertips than what has happened in Grenada.

Again, Grenada is not the biggest country, it is not the wealthiest, it is not the most populous, but it serves as a model. A model for Nicaragua, a model of what happened in Cuba. The Angola situation, Ethiopia. I would like to just point out that idea of models for a moment.

One of the pages in this diary of Liam James', one of the Central Committee members, talked about his meeting with "B." "B" is Bishop, and

he refers to Maurice Bishop as "B" throughout the book. There are three items here on this particular meeting day in the meeting with "B."

One, Model for Seizing State Power. Two, Model for Economic and Military Destabilization. And, three, Model for Terrorism Against the People.

□ 1600

This is pretty strong stuff. And if the Soviets and the Cubans are responsible for this kind of Communist model-building in Grenada as all of the documentation shows that they were, and if they are active in Nicaragua as they are today, then one needs to draw the simple conclusion that if we could ever break into the hall of documents or the archives in Managua, we would come up with perhaps more than 35,000 pounds, and we would come up with a teaching week that we could conduct calling it the lessons of Nicaragua Week.

I will close with the comment that what resulted in Grenada is a very hopeful sign for Western civilization, because, number one, it showed that a Communist regime could be turned around, that it was humanly possible, and that gives great hope to resistance movements fighting in Angola, in Cambodia, in Ethiopia and in Nicaragua itself. It gives great hope to what is the real trend in revolutionary movements in the 1980's, and that is revolutionary movements against Marxist-Leninist governments.

The idea, the very idea that poorly equipped, freezing, hungry freedom fighters in Afghanistan could be taking on the entire weight of the Red Army, some 125,000 strong, is in itself a miraculous idea. And that gives hope to other revolutionary movements which have taken hold around the globe comprising this new trend.

I commend once again the diligent originators of this resolution, Representatives GINGRICH and SKELTON. I call upon my colleagues to play their pertinent role in the Lessons of Grenada Week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2781

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor on the bill, H.R. 2781.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

FIREARMS OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I filed Discharge Petition No. 4 which will bring the Firearms Owners' Protection Act to the floor. I am greatly encouraged by the support given by my colleagues so soon.

I want to thank my good friends—LARRY CRAIG, TOMMY ROBINSON, and RON MARLENEE—for joining me in this special order to discuss the philosophy and implications of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act.

The Protection Act represents the second most important step in the history of American gun owners—the first was the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Volkmer-McClure Firearms Protection Act is the result of 6 years effort to guarantee the liberties of those who enjoy the right to own firearms for sport, recreation, and protection. The Protection Act will make the provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act reflect the values and heritage of this country by directing enforcement toward those who illegally traffic in firearms, toward those who criminally use firearms and away from regulation of the law-abiding citizen. This bill will modify the primary Federal law affecting our 200,000 licensed firearms dealers and 80 million firearms owners and collectors to insure their civil rights are not abused as they presently are under the 1968 Gun Control Act.

The 1968 Gun Control Act was hastily drafted during a time of tumult in the country. One of its stated purposes was "To provide support to Federal, States, and local law enforcement in their fight against crime and violence." Along the way this act required persons "engaging in the business" of dealing in firearms to obtain a license, required these dealers to maintain records of sales, and imposed felony penalties, forfeiture of firearms, and other penalties on unintentional violators.

Enforcement agencies, like most organizations seek to grow. Over the 12 years following enactment of the 1968 Gun Control Act, the firearms enforcement unit grew from an IRS subunit with 214 agents to a full Treasury Bureau—Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms—with more than 1,200 agents on firearm-related duties. Such explosive growth required impressive results, and the 1968 Gun Control Act provid-

ed the open door to make easy cases against unsuspecting persons. With the strict liability provided by the act even the most trivial and unintentional misstep would do.

As a result many of these trivial cases began to be brought to my attention in which the purpose of the original act had clearly been ignored. And another stated intent of the act—"to place any undue or unnecessary Federal restriction or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms"—was clearly violated by the technical enforcement practices being utilized. Citizens such as a disabled veteran and Boy Scout leader, a policeman in Maryland, who as a French national earned his American citizenship by volunteering for the Army during the Vietnam war, and an elderly couple in rural New Mexico were just examples of those law abiding individuals caught up in the web of bureaucratic technical enforcement. This is why I first introduced the Firearms Owners' Protection Act in September 1979.

At that time, I was a member of the Judiciary Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Crime which has jurisdiction over firearms legislation. By the end of the 96th Congress 181 House Members had cosponsored the Protection Act, including a majority of the subcommittee. What was the result of this show of support—nothing. No hearings were held on the merits of the legislation, and the one hearing dealing with BATF oversight was adjourned when we began going too deeply—for the chairman—into BATF practices. My good friend, JIM MCCLURE, introduced Senate companion legislation during the same Congress and secured majority cosponsorship of that body before adjournment.

In the 97th Congress the Protection Act was again introduced by Senator MCCLURE and myself. In the House 180 of our colleagues again cosponsored the bill and again no action of any kind occurred in the House Judiciary Committee. Our colleagues in the other body, however, held 3 days of hearings, specifically on the merits of the legislation. Also, during this Congress a series of meetings among officials of BATF, the White House, represented by now Attorney General Meese, Neal Knox of the NRA, Senator MCCLURE, and myself, resulted in a number of modifications which met Federal law enforcement concerns and were agreed to. Ultimately, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported a modified version of the bill but unfortunately the Congress adjourned sine die before the full Senate could act.

Again, in the 98th Congress the legislation was introduced and again no action occurred in the House. The other body, however, held two additional days of hearings on the merits of the bill and following another series

of meetings with Treasury and White House officials further refined the bill to insure no adverse law enforcement effects. The Senate Judiciary Committee again reported the Firearms Owners' Protection Act but again sine die adjournment prevented action.

This brings us up to the current Congress. Because 5 days of hearings had previously been held and the bill twice reported by the Judiciary Committee, by unanimous consent, the Senate bill was held at the desk and became eligible for immediate floor consideration.

As we all know, on July 9 the Senate passed the Firearms Owners' Protection Act by the overwhelming vote of 79-15. Because of the history of strong support for the protection act many people have asked why the House has not acted upon the legislation. I believe that the answer lies in anti-firearm ownership philosophy which the chairman of the Judiciary Committee holds. Chairman RODINO's first public comment upon passage by the Senate of the legislation was "the bill is dead on arrival in the House." These are hardly the comments of a chairman who will give serious consideration to the merits of the legislation. In addition his bias against firearms ownership can be best illustrated by this comment before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime on March 4, 1982. The chairman stated in reference to his gun control legislation (the Kennedy-Rodino bill): "I do not claim that it will stop crime. I realize that, despite a national law, criminals would continue to find ways to get these deadly weapons." If a national law which would ban the manufacture and possession of some firearms, and would seriously restrict a citizen's ability to own other firearms, but will not prevent criminals from acquiring firearms—then what is its purpose?

The only purpose can be to prevent the lawful ownership of firearms by the general public. In other words, those who control the Judiciary Committee do not believe anyone should own a firearm because they find no use for them. I believe the chairman will get a strong argument on that point.

To emphasize this point I would like to share a letter from one of my constituents representing 30 percent of the adults in the country that hunt.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOLKMER: I have been trying to write this letter for what seems to have been all morning. I wanted this letter to sound really official but I'm a mechanic not a businessman. I even have a dictionary next to me so I can spell all of my words correctly. I guess there hasn't been an issue of as great as importance to me as this gun control business.

Sir, My two boys are coming of age when they will soon be joining me on my hunting trips for deer and turkey. There are many good memories that a person gathers over

the years of hunting. It is truly impossible to put these memories into words on a sheet of paper for example how the hair stands up on the back of your neck when that ole boss gobbler cuts the complete quiet on a fresh spring morning or when that buck of a lifetime has made the largest scrape you have ever seen in your area and you know that this is the year the two of you will finally meet.

I want my sons to have the right to gather their own memories and join me on these hunting trips. I guess that the people that are trying to take our firearms away from us have just not experienced the pleasure of hunting.

So sir, I am counting on you to help pass the McClure-Volkmer firearms owners protection bill.

Sincerely,

TERRY L. SEALS.

□ 1610

Before I go any further, I would like to say that the strong opposition to this legislation, of course, comes from the National Coalition to Ban Handguns. They have repeatedly wrongly characterized this legislation and tried to make it out that it is legislation that will assist criminals and felons. As one who has been in the past strongly supportive of legislation for mandatory sentences for those who commit a crime with the use of a weapon in the commission of a crime, I would like to say that that characterization is all wrong.

I have here a newspaper that was printed in my district during the last campaign. I would like to quote from here. It says that this bill that we have would destroy the limited Federal protection that prohibits handguns from being purchased by felons, fugitives, drug addicts, court-adjudged mentally defective people.

It does no such thing, but these are the kinds of misrepresentations that opponents of this legislation would try to leave the law-abiding public, law-enforcement officials to believe.

It does not do anything like that.

It also says that it is a mail-order bill, to permit mail-order sales. It does not. It does not change any provision in the present law in regard to mail-order sales. It does not change any provision in the law that now prohibits felons, former felons, criminals, mentally defective persons, drug addicts, or anybody else that are presently restricted from buying guns. It does not change the law to permit them to do so.

These are things that are put out by those who want to take everybody's gun away, every gun, every rifle, every shotgun, from every hunter, from every law-abiding citizen in this country. They are known as the Handgun Control Coalition, the handgun control people. They are putting out information around the Hill in the last few days, including today, that again is misrepresentative. I believe everybody should take that into consider-

ation. This is a sportsmen's bill. It is a bill to deal with some of the problems that have been created by legislation that was passed in 1968, in the Gun Control Act of 1968.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG].

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for taking this special order and for his phenomenal leadership on this critical national issue. It has been my pleasure to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] over the last several months in putting together the rule and the discharge petition that is now before this body.

I would like to talk from a slightly different point of view, but certainly one that coincides directly with my colleague's concerns and why he has become a leader, with Senator McCURE of Idaho, in this very, very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Firearm Owners Protection Act is designed to correct a serious misapplication of the law. It is not an antigun-control move, nor is it designed to subvert the intent of the law as it now stands. Innocent citizens who have had no intention of wrongdoing are being persecuted and prosecuted. It is our task to bring these injustices to a proper and a prompt end.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 was conceived and brought forth in an atmosphere of hysteria, not only here in the Congress of the United States, but across this country. Assassinations of leading and beloved Americans had become too commonplace and the citizenry demanded, and rightfully so, that Congress take some form of steps, some immediate action, to counter these kinds of tragedies that were going on in our country and, of course, the Congress acted. It acted in a swift way and we are now beginning to feel the consequences of that act today; that as happens all too often, the steps that we took here in this body to satisfy what was public clamor for a solution failed in providing any kind of solution whatsoever.

The 1968 act introduced an era of violence which dimmed even the horrifying killings that had brought forth the very act itself.

From 1967 through 1972, the national homicide and handgun homicide rate rose by half in this country, while robbers and robberies involving the use of handguns nearly tripled.

In other words, did the law of 1968 work? No, of course, it did not work. We know that now. We have records to prove and statistics to demonstrate that the act itself served really no purpose whatsoever.

It can potentially affect, though, nearly half the households in America today, for this number, nearly half of the households in America today, own guns and are exposed to the needless

and counterproductive application of the 1968 law.

This problem is not only a potential one, it is a real one that is occurring on a day-to-day basis in every community and in every State and in every county across this country. It is a fact and this legislation attempts to deal with it.

The Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution has found that 75 percent—now, let me repeat that figure—that 75 percent of the Federal firearms prosecutions are aimed at ordinary citizens who have neither criminal intent nor any idea of breaking the law.

In other words, the 1968 Gun Control Act is resulting in the prosecution of innocent citizens in every State who have done nothing more criminal than to own a gun or to result from some slight mistake in a bookkeeping error that is easily correctable.

This is a situation that this act can correct and will correct if this body is courageous enough to move as rapidly as the Senate has.

With so much enforcement effort being directed toward noncriminals, we continue to see those who do the actual wrong going free. A society in which the innocent are punished and the guilty left untouched is a society in serious trouble, and in my opinion the 1968 act contributed to that kind of attitude in our country.

Every item in the Firearms Owner Protection Act is designed to correct and recognize a documented flaw in the 1968 act. Every concept is shaped to free those who enforce the law, to pursue those who break it with the intent of doing wrong. It targets those who knowingly sell weapons to those who are prohibited from owning them and who are the violators of the law, as well as those who use them for purposes contrary to the interests of our society.

The proposal we seek to bring to this House floor will not give free rein or undue encouragement to all owners of firearms. Substantial regulations will remain on the books to ensure that guns of all kinds are used properly, as they should be and as they are by the majority, the substantial majority of gun owners in this country. Legitimate owners of firearms recognize their responsibilities and live up to them under the Constitution. They should be protected. They should not be prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has received the careful thought and sober review which should have gone into the original act in 1968 and which we now attempt to correct today.

Let us now in a calmer environment, in a calmer atmosphere, right the wrongs Congress has created and free the forces of law to do their rightful work, and that is to protect those of us and the gun owners across this coun-

try who are the innocent, who are currently being prosecuted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by a good many Members here on the floor why, in view of the hearings scheduled by the House Judiciary Committee, as my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, has mentioned, should we seek to discharge this issue at this time?

Well, it is awfully hard to believe that an issue like this which the American public are clamoring for should not get a fair hearing and fair review before the chairman of the proper committee, and that is the House Judiciary Committee; but as my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, has mentioned, the chairman of that committee right up front on the day that it passed the Senate told us exactly what he thought of it, and those comments were, "Dead on arrival."

Now, what does that tell us? That tells us very clearly that the opportunity for fair hearings, but more importantly, the opportunity to move from fair hearings to the floor for a good, clean up-or-down vote, to allow the membership of this body in representation of their constituency across the Nation, to reflect the attitude of that constituency, simply will not be given an opportunity unless we follow the route that we have chosen and that, of course, is to discharge a rule that will give that kind of fairness and direct participation on the floor.

Now, that is what we are about, Members of this body, is to discharge the rule, not the bill, but to then give the opportunity of fair discourse on this floor and a chance for the Members of this body to get a clean up-or-down vote on a most critical issue.

As I mentioned in my earlier comments, it is not our intent, and I think anybody who reads McClure-Volkmer S. 49 knows this is not an intent to subvert the law. This is clearly an intent to correct the law that was poorly thought out, that was moved in a period of hysteria in this country and that has today now built a record of misapplication in its targeting of the innocent, and more importantly, the honest, the fair, and the law-abiding citizen who believes, as many of us do, that it is their right to own and bear arms.

I appreciate the leadership of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in this area. It is my privilege to work with him on this discharge and the passage here on the floor of this most important legislation.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for his remarks and also wish to commend him for the work that he has put into this, not only in helping with the rule, but in planning strategy and other things on the legislation. His advice has been most welcome and very well taken and

I appreciate it very much. I appreciate his strong support and look forward to working with the gentleman to a time when we will be able to finally have a chance to even debate this issue on the floor of this House.

As we know, the Judiciary Committee since 1979 has not even given us that opportunity and this at least by discharging the rule will give us a chance.

□ 1625

As the gentleman knows, in the rule we give them the opportunity to offer amendments, et cetera, to the bill, so we are trying to be very fair about it, where I do not think they have been very fair to us at all.

Mr. CRAIG. If the gentleman will yield further, briefly, one of the considerations that both the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and I, and others who worked together to craft this rule took under very long and hard consideration was openness and fairness.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. CRAIG. It was not our intent to block any effort, but to give a direct and open opportunity here on the floor for all participants. Let me congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for bringing forth that kind of rule. There are those here on the floor who, for one reason or another, and in almost always sincere applications, like not to use a discharge petition because they believe it overrules the leadership of this body and certainly the activities that are the prerogative of the chairman. It was with that consideration that this rule was crafted. We believe it is the kind of rule that almost anyone can sign off on and support because of its openness, and that is why we felt we could move it on a discharge because of that fair play element that is clearly written within the rule, and the gentleman is to be congratulated, HAROLD, for that kind of leadership in the crafting of that rule.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri also for filing the discharge petition today to enable the Firearm Owner's Protection Act, H.R. 945, to be brought to the House floor. I have signed this petition, and I serve as a cosponsor of this bill.

This petition is not an effort to prevent a full review and open debate on gun issues. On the contrary, it will allow the opportunity to have this debate on the House floor where all Members can participate and to do so for the first time.

The House Committee on the Judiciary is beginning a series of hearings around the country on gun issues, and I commend those efforts to obtain public comments on pending legislation, but I also think this discharge petition is absolutely necessary to ensure that the House will have the opportunity to consider the Firearm Owners' Protection Act and other measures which could be offered under this rule, rather than have the legislation bottlenecked in the Committee on the Judiciary.

In the past, the Committee on the Judiciary has worked in this area to restrict consideration of legislation to protect the constitutional rights of many by adhering to opinions of few who favor legislation to ban firearms for law-abiding citizens. Earlier this year, the Senate overwhelmingly approved the Firearm Owner's Protection Act, which makes revisions to the Gun Control Act of 1968. This legislation brings needed protections to gun owners and to gun dealers who legitimately own and sell firearms for protection and sporting purposes, and who are guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms under the Constitution.

Unfortunately, under enforcement of our current gun laws, many have been harassed and abused. I am a staunch supporter of the Constitution and believe that our forefathers, in their infinite wisdom, were correct in setting in concrete basic rights for our citizens. It is the preservation of these rights, in particular the second amendment to keep and bear arms, that we seek to protect through the Firearm Owner's Protection Act.

I have heard from numerous sportsmen and gun owners in Louisiana who feel that their constitutional rights should be protected, and they strongly support this legislation. Therefore, this legislation ought to be brought to the House floor and their opinions ought to be viewed and their rights ought to be asserted.

I support it as well, as I do not feel that gun control deters criminals, but only those who would be protected from them by having firearms. I can well understand law enforcement concerns for deterring criminals from obtaining firearms. My own brother is a career policeman and has been for 14 years. I was one briefly in the military. But our focus needs to be not on keeping guns from the lawful citizens but on more stringent penalties for criminals who commit crimes with firearms.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have sponsored legislation requiring mandatory penalties for the commission of a crime with a firearm, and I am very pleased to see this was incorporated in the crime reform package which was enacted last year by the Congress and is also contained again in the Firearm Owners' Protection Act as passed by the Senate.

Current laws to prevent convicted felons from owning or possessing guns are not preventing criminals from obtaining them. As I said earlier, they are burdening the law-abiding citizens who want to own firearms, as our Constitution guarantees them the right to do. So the answer is not in penalizing sportsmen and your and my neighbors who want to own firearms. We need to make sure their rights are not infringed upon.

We need to pass and sign this discharge petition and I urge all of my colleagues on the House floor to join us in so doing. We need to bring these bills to the House floor for debate and then to pass proper gun laws that can properly regulate without over-regulating or harassing the American people.

I would say to the gentleman who is the lead author in this legislation, he has already commented that this bill would not allow mail order sales or in any way repeal the law as passed in 1968 barring that. Is that correct?

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. I would like to emphasize that with the gentleman from Louisiana: That we do not have any effect on mail order sales at all. They are prohibited under the 1968 Gun Control Act. We do not change that one bit, and any allegation by anybody to the extent that the legislation does do it is a misrepresentation.

Mr. MOORE. Would this bill forbid inspections of dealers, except when preceded by advance notice?

Mr. VOLKMER. No; it does not forbid them. We do set out criteria for inspections. We allow inspections, in other words, if law enforcement officials wish to trace a firearm, they can inspect the records, if it is necessary, and to investigate a criminal offense where a weapon was used, they can inspect premises. The Secretary or the BATF would have an allowance for an annual inspection to determine whether or not the person is keeping accurate and proper records. If the authorities, BATF again, or Treasury, were to determine that a person perhaps is violating the law, like any other occasion when you are going to inspect someone's premises for a law violation, you can get a search warrant and then to in and inspect the premises.

So the allegation that we restrict them or do not permit inspection of these records is not correct.

Mr. MOORE. As a matter of fact, as I understand the legislation, the only time we require advance notice for an inspection of a dealer is merely on a courtesy visit, is that correct?

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman very much, and I am pleased to join the gentleman. Again, I would urge

my colleagues to sign this discharge petition.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri. As he well knows, I worked with him on the rule and I have worked with him to ask people to sign the discharge petition for which, as of this afternoon, we have 44 sponsors of that petition, which I think is remarkable.

First I would like to say that it is a sad commentary, in reference to the way our House operates, that we have to be here today, but it should not surprise us. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has buried basically every bill that deals with citizens' rights and their feelings and their opinions and how others think our Government ought to operate. We go back to busing, abortion, school prayer, et cetera. It does not surprise me.

But one thing I feel good about today is that I believe there is a groundswell of support in this House of Representatives to send a strong message not only to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), our distinguished chairman, one who, I might add, if you really want to hide something from him, put it in the law book, but I think there is a strong groundswell of support in this House that if something does not change as far as the way the Committee on the Judiciary buries bills that we, the Members of this great body, elected by our constituents to come up here and work for them, if they do not change what they are doing, I think we might see some changes made in the direction of that committee the next time around.

I know my time is limited and I do not want to take any time away from some of our colleagues, but I feel compelled to ask my colleagues to listen briefly to some statistics that will be brought out as we further debate the McClure-Volkmer bill.

According to the latest FBI National Crime Report of 1984, firearm involvement in homicides fell from 68 percent in 1974 to 59 percent a decade later. The family homicide rate, which is the closest statistical approximation to the so-called crime of passion, dropped from 2.4 per 100,000 in 1976 to 1.4 per 100,000 last year, the lowest level recorded since prohibition, and that is against the backdrop that now we have more weapons in this country than we have ever had before.

Also, in a recent study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice, it was found that among convicted felons, the one group that we fear the

most, 69 percent did not carry firearms. Instead, they carried knives, razors, brass knuckles, et cetera.

□ 1635

The fear of stiffer sentences caused 79 percent of the respondents not to carry guns. Eighty-eight percent of the criminals questioned felt that gun laws only affected law-abiding citizens.

Now please listen to me. These are criminals incarcerated in penitentiaries. Eighty-eight percent felt that gun laws only affected law-abiding citizens. And in fact, in this study it was determined that the criminal's fear of the armed victim was pronounced. In States with less-restrictive gun control laws, criminals were less likely to attack citizens because of the possibility that they might be armed.

In other words, they were afraid they might be shot by the person that lived in the house that they were trying to break into.

Also, 83 percent of the criminals surveyed said that if they could not obtain a handgun, they would simply saw off a rifle or a shotgun.

The statistics go on and on. The upshot of the study was that criminals do not go to the retail store and buy firearms. They either steal them or buy them on the black market.

For the rest of my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself from the law-enforcement perspective. Prior to entering this great institution, I spent 21 years in the criminal justice field, starting out as a student. Later I taught criminal justice courses, and in the latter 10 years of my career. I served in law-enforcement administrative positions dating back to the early 1970's when I was a police chief. Later on, I served in Governor Clinton's cabinet in Arkansas as the director of the State Department of Public Safety, not only over the Arkansas State Police, but over our crime reporting agencies and other law-enforcement-type operations in the State of Arkansas.

Prior to coming to this body, I served two terms as the chief law enforcement officer in Pulaski County, AR, Little Rock, where I served as sheriff.

It greatly disturbs me when I see that a group called Handgun Control, Inc. puts out a publication that says law enforcement says vote no on S. 49. I am not going to burden my colleagues with what is inside this, but I am a little bit disappointed with some of my former colleagues in the law enforcement field, especially the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which is a great organization that I once belonged to, and also the National Sheriffs Association.

Come on, fellows, all of you know what the real causes of crime are. And if you would just read the latest Crime in the United States book, which all of

you have on your desk, you would know that there are many causes of crime. There are about 11 socioeconomic factors, as the FBI calls them, and they are listed in this book. There is no mention in this book about firearms as being a cause of crime.

The truth of the matter is, the reason we have crime in this country, from the law-enforcement perspective, is simply that most of you spend entirely too much time using radar to stop law-abiding citizens traveling a few miles per hour over the speed limit instead of patrolling residential areas and trying to catch criminals. And I know why you do it. You have to do it to raise revenue.

But do not put your name on something to try and convince the Members of this great body and the citizens of the United States of America that you are trying to say that because we have a right under the Constitution to bear arms and protect ourselves, mainly because if you would start creating a more proactive law-enforcement scenario in this country, and stop spending too much time writing traffic tickets, spend more time going after the real criminals, patrolling neighborhoods, protecting those that are paying your salaries, then I think we might see your part of the crime rate go down.

There are many, many other factors that I will elaborate on once we get the magic number of individuals to sign our petition of discharge. But I want to close by saying this: Gentlemen, I know many of you are going to come down to the well and try to argue for your positions. But I want to sort of warn you today, I am prepared for you, all of you on the Judiciary Committee that think you really know something about crime in this country. I have looked at some of your records, and I think my friend from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, is going to talk about that.

You are not really concerned about protecting the rights of citizens and the rights of your constituents. You are more concerned about protecting the rights of the criminals, because somehow you think that the Constitution was written only to protect the criminal, only to protect the minority viewpoint.

Well, I for one, think the Constitution was written mainly to protect we, the law-abiding citizens, and to protect the innocent.

Mr. VOLKMER. Before the gentleman yields back, I would like to just emphasize again that the blue flyer-like that was put out, in the very minor print, it seems to say vote no to law enforcement, but let us really find out who is that printed by.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is printed by the Handgun Control, Inc.

Mr. VOLKMER. And those are the people that want to take anybody's gun away from them, not only handguns, but their ultimate aim is to take away rifles and shotguns.

Mr. ROBINSON. And then only the Sandinistas and the Communists will have guns.

Mr. VOLKMER. Perhaps some of the people that were passing those out may have some guns. And you do have perhaps some law-enforcement people that I think are very misguided that feel they are the only ones that have guns and they are the ones that take on the criminals and nobody else. But I differ with that.

Mr. ROBINSON. If my colleague will yield for a moment, my colleague is a former prosecutor and I am a former law enforcement officer.

Let me tell the gentleman something. I started out as a rookie cop. I spent 21 years of my life out there risking my life every day. I never investigated a crime in which I went down to the local retail store and looked at the ATF form to see which criminal purchased that firearm. That is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

I am looking forward to this battle, and we are going to win this.

Mr. VOLKMER. If we had more time, we would get into a debate. We find that criminals do not go down to buy their guns at the dealer, and register them and everything and give their name and everything else. That is not the way. The gentleman knows, he has been in the business, and I have been in the business, that that is not the way they get their guns.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is not the way it happens.

Mr. VOLKMER. They get them from theft of illegal purchases, and that is the way they get their guns, not through the people that are governed by this legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield back to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and want to congratulate him for bringing this special order. Also, I sympathize with and recognize the sense of frustration the gentleman from Missouri has to deal with. The gentleman has fought so long and hard to bring this issue to the floor and has been frustrated every term, and I share that sense of frustration.

I am one of those who is reluctant to consider the discharge petition route because it is an extraordinary route, and it does somewhat circumvent the orderly procedures of the House. But in this case, there really is no other way to go. That is why I am going to

break precedent in my case and sign the discharge petition.

Mr. VOLKMER. I appreciate that.

Mr. CLINGER. Because I deeply share the gentleman's sense of frustration of not being able to bring this issue before us.

I represent a very rural district in northern Pennsylvania. I would like to just come back a moment to why this bill is so terribly important to our hunting population and to sportsmen everywhere.

But in my district, with an abundance of forests, deer and other game, Pennsylvania has the largest number of deer licenses issued anywhere in the country. It is a hunter's paradise, and it is a time-honored tradition for many families in my district, as well as, I am aware, throughout the country. It is a sport that is often shared, as has been mentioned earlier today, by many members of a family. It is a family recreation. And I think respect for firearms, at least in my experience, is taught at a very early age to all of the family members.

More importantly, I think new hunters receive proper instruction from experienced family members. It is a tradition that is handed down from father to son, as the gentleman alluded to in the letter he read from his constituent.

The hunters who I represent in this body have told me that passage of this legislation is absolutely necessary to check the mindless bureaucracy in place at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms at the present time. It is really an unwarranted harassment of decent, law-abiding citizens by this agency, and we have to bring it to a stop. And this is really the only vehicle which will do that. It is going to remove those provisions of law which they have been able to use to intimidate. I think this kind of approach by the BATF has no place in a democracy where, as we all know, the right to bear arms is guaranteed by the 2d amendment to the Constitution.

Restaurants and hotels are another issue that I would like to point to. What a tremendous amount of help hunting is to our peripheral industries. Restaurants, hotels and other business establishments in my district welcome the patronage of hunters visiting from all over the country, as tourism is an important element in the economic health of our area, as I am sure of many others.

The "Firearm Owners' Protection Act," and I think I want to emphasize this, would protect the hunter who might travel through a State or local jurisdiction that restricts the ownership or possession of firearms while he or she is heading for one of the popular hunting places, in my case, near a place called Tionesta or Emporium, PA. Without the protection that this measure provides, honest hunters, I

am told, carrying unloaded and inaccessible firearms could unwittingly violate such a restriction and be charged with a criminal act. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. The present law in some localities and in States would mean that law-abiding citizens, hunters who have, let us say, a rifle or a shotgun, broken down, unloaded, inaccessible, let us say they are in a camper, driving a camper, and the rifle or shotgun is in the back of the camper, or if they are in a car and it is in the trunk, yet if they go through one of these States, they could be stopped, arrested, and charged with a criminal offense, fined and put in jail just for going through this jurisdiction when they are going hunting. And some people have to go through those areas in order to get to other places. That is why we make a provision in here that when you are doing this just for a lawful purpose, there is no reason to arrest these people and put them in jail.

Mr. CLINGER. And I do not really think that was our intent in passing the law as we did. I do not think we intended that.

Mr. VOLKMER. Most of this is State and local law, and I do not think they intend actually to pick up the innocent sportsmen. But it can be and it has happened. If you get persons in law enforcement who get carried away, or people, there are people who just, as we know, and we have been having about and we will hear about it more, that just believe that no one should have any guns, and those people are the kind that are going to enforce that type of law against normally law-abiding citizens.

Mr. CLINGER. I again thank the gentleman for his strong leadership in this area. I think we need to take a strong stand, as I think most of us have and will do against those people who commit crimes with guns. I would be the first one to support legislation that strengthens the penalties for those who commit crimes with guns.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would like to comment on that, if I may. It is very interesting that those in this body that basically support this legislation are those who in the past have strongly supported anticrime legislation, like the omnibus crime bill, the comprehensive crime bill that was put on last year, if the gentleman will remember, to the appropriations bill by way of an amendment in a motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California. That bill had been tied up basically in the House Judiciary Committee.

Those people who do not support mandatory sentencing for criminals, who feel that criminals should be given probation and parole, even if they use a gun in the commission of a

crime, those are the ones that have opposed this legislation. The people supporting this legislation say we have to have mandatory sentences, and let us put these criminals in jail.

So I think we have to recognize those that want to take the guns away basically say be soft on criminals, while those of us who feel we should let law-abiding citizens use their guns and have their guns for sporting purposes, we feel the best way to stop crime is to put the criminal in jail.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, the rights of Americans are being violated. For too long the efforts of antigun groups have eroded our constitutional right to keep and bear arms. It is time that the lawful firearm owner, those people of this country who responsibly own firearms, have a voice in Congress. That is why we are here today in support of H.R. 945—the Volkmer-McClure Firearm Owners Protection Act.

As we all know, the Senate passed the Volkmer-McClure bill on July 9 of this year by a vote of 79 to 15. That is the good news, the bad news is that Judiciary Committee Chairman ROTHMAN immediately declared the bill "dead on arrival" when it came to the House.

Even though the McClure-Volkmer bill has been introduced every Congress since 1978, and despite widespread support for the bill, the committee has consistently blocked consideration.

Now we must resort to going around the committee system—the democratic process has been effectively blocked by a few who refuse to abide by the second amendment which guarantees the right to keep and bear arms.

I am proud to have been one of the first to sign the discharge petition, and I admire the courage of my friend and colleague from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER. The decision to lead efforts to bypass the committee system must have been a difficult one.

You will hear the gun-control advocates claim that they are holding hearings and proceeding with legislation to reform the 1968 Gun Control Act. Some in Congress will say they won't sign a discharge petition if the committee appears to be working on the bill. "How dare you circumvent the process!" They'll cry.

Well, let me say that appearances may be deceiving. Through smoke and mirrors, groups like the National Coalition to Ban Handguns are working hand in hand with Chairman ROTHMAN to delay and ultimately kill this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about why I support H.R. 945, and

why I am 1,000 percent opposed to the gun control schemes being offered by those who oppose the Firearm Owners Protection Act. Instead, I will leave that to the bill's author and others here today.

I will, however, specifically look at the problems of waiting periods and offer some general comments.

Some Members in the other body attempted to attach an amendment establishing mandatory waiting periods before a firearm could be legally purchased. To many this seems like a harmless idea, but let me tell you what that really means and why we shouldn't have such waiting periods.

First, more than a dozen States already have waiting period laws on the books. If the States can enact such laws, there is no need for a Federal law. But more importantly, these waiting periods have not reduced violent crime. As violent crime has climbed in the United States as a whole, it has also climbed in those States with waiting periods.

California adopted a 5-day wait in 1965; 5 years later murder was up 46.8 percent. In 1976 they expanded this to 15 days; 5 years later murder was up 39.4 percent.

Second, in sophisticated studies of waiting periods, it has been found again and again that there is virtually no connection between waiting periods and gun murder, robbery, assault, suicide, or even accident rates.

Third, if waiting periods were effective, how long should they be? Many State legislatures have specifically voted against waiting periods. That is a decision for State lawmakers, not the U.S. Congress.

And fourth, isn't the objective of every Member of Congress to stop violent crime while protecting the rights of American citizens? Waiting periods don't stop criminals. Professional criminals don't buy guns "over-the-counter"; they buy them from other criminals.

Some will ask, "What about so-called crimes of passion?" Well, the idea that "crime of passion" killers go running to their neighborhood gun dealer to carry out their spur-of-the-moment crime is a myth. Their crimes use whatever is at hand—the kitchen knife, baseball bat, or whatever.

An enraged individual does not step back to carefully reflect upon the best means to carry out the crime he just conceived of moments earlier. In his homicidal state of mind, he doesn't analyze what weapon would be best, flip through the yellow pages to find the closest sporting goods store, drive to the store, carefully select a gun and ammunition, and then return to find his intended victim patiently waiting. That's just absurd.

The point is, waiting periods don't work. They only create more paper-

work for law-abiding gun dealers and inconvenience for honest citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the rural west. In just 1 day's mail last week, I received over 140 prices of mail supporting H.R. 945—the Volkmer-McClure Firearm Owners Protection Act. Totally, since the beginning of the year, I have received only two letters in favor of more gun control.

My constituents are willing to forgive many things from their elected Representatives, but any attempt to control their right to own and use guns isn't one of them. I've been hunting since I was just a small boy. I grew up in a home where responsible use of firearms was practically taught side-by-side with doing the chores and learning to read.

That's the way it is for the vast majority of Montanans. I object to gun control, and I especially object to congressional elitists forcing it down the throats of my constituents.

One aspect of the Volkmer-McClure bill is very similar to my own H.R. 2565 which would allow a legal gun owner the freedom to travel through other States with his firearm as long as it is unloaded, and securely packed away so it is not easily accessible.

As it stands now, different States have many different gun laws. Some areas, like Washington, DC and New York City, prohibit even the legal possession of a firearm.

If a gun owner leaves his home in Virginia, travels through the Nation's Capital on his way to do a little duck hunting in Maryland, he can be arrested for having his unloaded shotgun securely tucked away in the trunk of his car. That's wrong. Current laws now entrap the innocent, rather than convict hardcore criminals. I'm pleased this bill includes a concept I have proposed in my own legislation.

I will be doing a series of 1-minutes in the coming weeks and months to show why we need this bill now, and exposing the deceptions being spread by the radical, antigun forces.

When we opened up shop this morning, Congressman VOLKMER filed his discharge petition to finally bring this bill up for a vote. I am the fifth name on that petition, and I will be doing everything I possibly can to help my colleague from Missouri to get the 218 signatures necessary to bring up H.R. 945 for a vote.

Every voter in the Nation should ask: "What number are you on the discharge petition? Where do you rank on the scale of support for law-abiding citizens?"

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, I find that a very interesting point, because I am a strong supporter of our law enforcement officers, and for the law-abiding citizen, for the officer out there who is doing

his duty, protecting our property, protecting our lives; and I never argue with them when they come, and maybe I get a speeding ticket or something like that.

Basically that philosophy carries through here in Congress, but what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] are saying is that the supporters of this kind of legislation are strong supporters of law enforcement—

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. MARLENEE. And are strongly opposed to the criminal element who has been getting away with, if you will, murder in this Congress.

Mr. CLINGER. And the ones on the other hand who would oppose this legislation tend to be those that have a very permissive attitude toward mandatory sentencing.

Mr. MARLENEE. Well, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] previously said, those that want to coddle the criminal, basically.

Mr. CLINGER. I again commend the gentleman for his leadership. I think that you are to be commended for taking this special order, and I will now go into the well and sign the discharge petition.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman very much, I appreciate it.

I would like to recognize at this time the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, for far too long the 1968 Gun Control Act has enabled overzealous bureaucrats to harass and obstruct the activities of America's hunters and sportsmen.

Instead of focusing its activities on criminals who use guns to commit crimes, the BATF has all too often used its powers under the 1968 Gun Control Act to intimidate gun dealers, confiscate gun collectors, and infringe on the constitutional rights of honest sportsmen.

The McClure-Volkmer Firearms Owners' Protection Act (S. 49/H.R. 945) which I am proud to be a cosponsor of, would eliminate the technical provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act which are used to harass honest citizens, and would strengthen the penalties for using a gun to commit a crime.

By focusing on the criminal, and not the law-abiding citizen, we can take meaningful action against crime.

Mr. Speaker, the McClure-Volkmer Firearms Owners' Protection Act has passed the other body by a margin of more than five to one. It is time for the House of Representatives to stand up for the constitutional rights of the American people by passing this bill as well.

While I am pleased that the House Judiciary Committee has finally agreed to hold hearings on the Firearms Owners' Protection Act starting

on October 28, I am concerned by reports that committee leaders do not intend to report the bill to the full House. This suggests that the opponents of the bill do not dare bring the bill before the House because they know it will pass easily.

Our Government is a representative form of government, and the Representatives of the people deserve an opportunity to act on this important legislation. We must not allow an obstructionist minority to thwart the will of the people on a matter involving great constitutional principles.

That is why I am glad to join my colleagues Representatives VOLKMER, CRAIG, and DINGELL in signing a discharge petition to force this legislation out of committee and onto the House floor. This may be the only opportunity we have to implement the will of the people.

Through this discharge petition and this legislation we can end the BATF's entrapment and harassment of hunters, sportsmen, dealers, and collectors and provide mandatory jail sentences for criminals who use guns.

Mr. VOLKMER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inform the gentleman that he has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

Mr. MARLENEE. Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] on the legislation that he has offered, and ask him to yield for a question.

Coming from the State of Montana, I get quite a few letters from those supporting this important bill, but I would like to clear up a few misconceptions about the Firearm Owners' Protection Act.

First, would this bill allow criminals, felons, and terrorists to obtain guns? This is one of the most erroneous charges I think that have been leveled.

Mr. VOLKMER. No; and I can only say that most emphatically, we do not make any changes in the law as to who is permitted to purchase and acquire firearms; and we do not permit and nor would I ever sponsor any legislation that would permit criminals, felons, terrorists, or anybody else to go out and legally acquire firearms in any way.

Mr. MARLENEE. Now, another allegation against this bill that I have heard is that those opposing this bill are saying it allows an individual to go across a State border, walk into a sporting goods shop, buy a gun that his own State law prohibits; and this is not the case in Montana, but is this so in other areas?

Mr. VOLKMER. That is a complete misrepresentation of what this bill

does. Basically what the bill does is say that if it is lawful in your State of residence for you to buy a firearm, and if you are in a different State, another State, and it is lawful there for you to fire firearms in that city and State, we do not change any of those laws; it has to be lawful; then you can acquire firearms.

I know there have been misrepresentations saying that we are changing the local law or the State law and making them sell firearms even though their present law says no—we do not change that; local law or State law. If it is prohibited, then it cannot be done, that is all.

Mr. MARLENEE. I appreciate the gentleman's answers. These questions are extremely important because there is so much false information being circulated.

Mr. VOLKMER. A lot of misrepresentations are being bandied about.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, in 1776 when our forefathers drafted the U.S. Constitution, an amendment was added that guarantees Americans the right to bear arms. It is my belief and the view of an overwhelming number of my constituents, that this constitutional right has been severely limited by current law.

In 1968, Congress passed legislation designed to reduce the number of crimes committed with firearms in our Nation. However, rather than hindering the criminal who continues to have easy access to guns and ammunition through the black market, the 1968 legislation has penalized law-abiding citizens. Inconsistencies riddle current firearm laws. For instance, it is not a Federal offense for an individual to sell firearms to a convicted felon. At the same time, however, an honest citizen with no prior criminal record could be subjected to felony charges if he unintentionally violates some jurisdictional firearm restriction.

The majority of people in west Texas and our Nation have exercised their right to gun ownership with responsibility. It seems ironic that a law devised to curtail crime has, instead, infringed on one of our most treasured founding doctrines, the U.S. Constitution. Statistics show that laws devised to restrict gun ownership have little, if any, effect on crime.

The Firearm Owner's Protection Act of 1985, which is pending in the House Judiciary Committee, would eliminate the obvious flaws in current law that hinder innocent citizens rather than the criminal. Burdensome regulations would be modified and more stringent enforcement measures would be imple-

mented against individuals who use guns unlawfully.

The other body passed an identical piece of legislation earlier this year, and it is now up to the House to lift the restrictions imposed on the right to bear arms. A discharge petition has been circulated throughout the Chamber today in an effort to bring the Firearm Owner's Protection Act to the House floor for consideration. Review by the full House is necessary since some disturbing remarks were made which indicate that the bill would not receive an impartial hearing in the House Judiciary Committee.

Like most Americans, I am greatly concerned about our Nation's crime rate. However, laws which inhibit law-abiding individuals are an ineffective solution to the national crime problem. We must fortify Federal criminal penalties if we are to deter those individuals inclined to commit illegal acts. Let us be certain that we are penalizing the criminals—not the honest American citizen who chooses to own a gun for sport or protection.

Mr. Speaker, we must act to preserve the intent of our forefathers in drafting the Constitution. Without the right to bear arms, pioneers would never have survived the wilderness, our ancestors would have starved and our diverse and democratic Nation would not be as it is today. I consider Mr. VOLKMER's Firearm Owner's Protection Act to be a superior piece of legislation that redirects the restrictions on firearms to where those restrictions belong—on the criminal. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of the Firearm Owner's Protection Act of 1985.

Mr. VOLKMER. I appreciate the gentleman's support in working with us on the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I recognize the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS].

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in this special order focusing on the enforcement abuses of the Gun Control Act of 1968. I thank my esteemed colleague from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, for providing this forum to inform Members of the failures and abuses of the Gun Control Act of 1968 and to emphasize the urgent need to correct these abuses by enacting the Firearms Owners' Protection Act.

When Congress enacted the Gun Control Act of 1968 its goal was to reduce violent crime. The act was not intended to provide law enforcement with the power to harass and prosecute law-abiding citizens. Yet such activity has been the history of the enforcement and administration of this act. It has been used as a tool for prosecuting innocent collectors and owners unaware of the intricate, detailed, and complex compliance procedures contained in it.

The most shocking aspect of the undesired but authorized behavior under the Gun Control Act is the abridgement of fundamental civil liberties. The right to keep and bear arms is granted not because of a court decision or an administrative policy. In fact, as we all know, the right to keep and bear arms is guaranteed by the same document which grants this land its liberty—the Constitution.

But even if this were not enough, such behavior diverts valuable legal resources—judicial as well as law enforcement resources—from pursuing the very activity the act was intended to eliminate: violent crime. Instead, these legal resources have been used to build cases against law-abiding citizens who may have violated technical reporting requirements of the law. For example, under current law, the simplest recordkeeping oversight is a Federal felony, just as is the most severe or violent crime.

Let me assure you that these abuses are not imagined. Take the tragic story of one gun dealer, Richard Boulton. Mr. Boulton, a policeman, obtained a Federal firearm dealer's license, in order to sell firearms to other policemen. After he obtained a license, he was approached by a collector and asked to sell a few of his firearms. Because these were part of his personal collection, he felt he could sell them without the paperwork required of a licensed dealer's sales from inventory. After all, the Federal agent who issued him the license had told him that this was legal.

A few months later he awakened to a nightmare. A team of Federal agents arrested him, executed a search warrant on his home, searched his father's business, and confiscated his entire firearms collection. Most of his collection was in mint condition and many of the guns had never been fired. Those guns were terribly abused and damaged in the confiscation. When his case came for trial he seemed to have the best defense imaginable. Indeed, the director of the prosecuting agency agreed that Mr. Boulton's actions had been legal.

I wish I could conclude with the vindication of this citizen. But the court decided otherwise. Today this man, who never had so much as a traffic ticket, cannot get a job or even hold the mortgage on his house.

Of course, these abuses must be stopped. That is why I have cosponsored the Firearms Owners' Protection Act.

Of the many bills which face this Congress, few are more important to me and the people of Idaho's Second District than the Firearms Owners' Protection Act. In Idaho, where gun ownership is central to our tradition and heritage, grassroots support for this legislation is tremendous.

The Firearms Owner's Protection Act seeks merely to protect legitimate gun owners and collectors from the enforcement of irresponsible law. From the evidence it is clear that a change is needed—a fundamental redirection of the law and its enforcement. The law should prosecute criminals, not create them with red tape. To ensure this, I ask my distinguished colleagues to sign the discharge petition so that we can pass this needed legislation without further delay.

□ 1700

Again, I congratulate my colleague, Mr. VOLKMER, for his leadership in this legislation and wish him the best success.

Mr. VOLKMER. I, too, thank the gentleman from Idaho for his past support and his continued support on this legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

I have long awaited this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak out for the rights of Americans, rights that are being violated.

For too long the efforts of the anti-gun groups have eroded our constitutional right to keep and bear arms. It is time that the lawful firearm owner, those people of this country who responsibly own firearms, have a voice in Congress, and I am pleased that the gentleman from Missouri has spoken out and that the rest of us can join him in that. That is why we are here today, in support of H.R. 945, the Volkmer-McClure Firearms Owners Protection Act.

I am proud to have been one of the first to sign the discharge petition. I admire the courage of my friend and colleague who has put this forth.

The decision to lead the efforts to bypass the committee system must have been a difficult one. I would like to speak just briefly to the waiting period.

More than a dozen States have a waiting period law on the books. If the States can enact such law, why do we in Congress need to be involved in that area? But, more importantly, those waiting periods have not reduced violent crime. As violent crime has climbed in the United States as a whole, it has also climbed in those States with waiting periods.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the rural West. In just 1 day's mail last week I received over 140 pieces of mail supporting H.R. 945, in 1 day, 140 pieces of mail in support of the Volkmer-McClure Act.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Firearms Owners Protection Act. This legislation is long overdue and my distinguished colleague from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, has my sin-

cere gratitude for his leadership on the issue.

Our Founding Fathers stated the case so succinctly in the second amendment to the Constitution: "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

The 1968 Gun Control Act was hailed by some as landmark legislation, but innocent gunowners have been unfairly stigmatized by some portions of the act. I believe too much emphasis was placed on efforts directed against law-abiding citizens rather than hardened criminals.

The problems inherent in the 1968 Gun Control Act have been exposed by Mr. VOLKMER and documented in congressional oversight hearings.

This bill corrects parts of the Gun Control Act which were clearly unnecessary. By removing these extraneous matters from the law, we allow the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to devote its energies to the real priorities of crime and violence in our society.

The Firearms Owners Protection Act corrects some of the problems of the 1968 Gun Control Act. This bill will allow for continued enforcement of the law against dealers who supply arms when they should not be supplied. This bill will allow proper records to be kept.

Licensing requirements will be clearly defined, eliminating bureaucratic hassles for firearms owners and requiring it in instances where it can serve a real function. This bill will compel the Government to show criminal intent before a citizen is brought up on felony charges. It institutes new, fair rules on search and seizure and allows for the transportation of unloaded, stored weapons through any jurisdiction. We agree that local governments should be able to determine what is best for their area, but it is wrong to treat transportation through a jurisdiction and use equally.

All of us agree on the need of Federal involvement to stop violent criminals from obtaining firearms and none of us have objections to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms efforts toward that goal.

This legislation will protect the constitutional rights of the gunowner and concentrate Government efforts on the group that gives firearms owners a bad name: hardened criminals.

I am pleased to support this excellent legislation and to sign the discharge petition. America's firearms owners deserve the rights the second amendment promises. Again, I thank Mr. VOLKMER for his efforts to stop crime and protect the constitutional rights of gun-owning Americans.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States generates stacks upon stacks of records. Seldom, however, do we study the records of the past in order to guide us into the future.

I refer my colleagues to page 94 of Senate Report No. 1501 of the 90th Congress, 2d session—the report on the Gun Control Act of 1968.

Page 94 contains the Individual Views of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my fellow Mississippian, Senator James O.

Eastland—who eloquently stated his reasons for opposing this law.

Mr. Eastland, who many of you knew while he was Speaker pro tem of the Senate, is greatly respected by Members of both bodies, Republicans as well as his fellow Democrats.

Mr. Eastland has never viewed the "gun control" question as a partisan issue, or as a liberal-conservative issue—and neither does this Member, or the distinguished bipartisan group which favor reforms of the Gun Control Act through passage of the McClure-Volkmer bill.

These reforms should be adopted for the very reason that Mr. Eastland predicted when this law was enacted: the Gun Control Act has had no visible effect upon crime.

In fact, the use of firearms in crimes has more than doubled since this law went into effect.

Criminals by definition are those who disobey the law, including gun laws. That is why criminals still obtain guns without the slightest difficulty—regardless of the severity of the laws in their area.

The ease with which criminals obtain guns—despite the prohibitions upon criminal ownership contained in the Gun Control Act—was made clear in a new Justice Department study released only a few days ago.

But instead of getting rid of a useless law, or at least getting rid of some of the worst provisions of that law, the opponents of McClure-Volkmer want to make the law even more restrictive.

Like the old-time snake-oil salesman whose nostrums fail to work, their excuse is that the patient didn't take enough snake oil.

That is precisely what Mr. Eastland predicted 16 years ago. Let us carefully consider Mr. Eastland's words of wisdom.

He wrote:

It is instructive to consider the tactics and strategy of those who would control human nature by the passage of Federal legislation. Regardless of what Congress does to appease their demands in any given area of legislation, those who would control the human heart by passing another law always return to the next Congress to demand even more sweeping laws.

Their complaint is always that although the law enacted by the previous Congress has slightly improved the situation, that law has not been "effective" in correcting the evil, and that, thus, a more "effective law" is needed at once.

"The supporters of such a bill," he wrote, "will say that although Congress has enacted S. 3633—the Gun Control Act of 1968—Americans are still killing each other with guns."

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the record will show that Mr. Eastland's prediction came true. In the very next session, the Congress did consider, and reject, extremely restrictive laws requiring the registration and licensing of all firearms—handguns, shotguns, and rifles.

The advocates of such laws said, as the opponents of McClure-Volkmer now say, that the Gun Control Act "isn't strong

enough"—but there are few today who openly call for new restrictions upon rifles and shotguns.

But within a year or two after the 1968 law went into effect, many in the leadership of the "gun control" movement began to publicly proclaim their desires for the banning of all handguns—or the banning of certain guns—matching another of Mr. Eastland's predictions.

Those efforts caused a backlash among the public. Accordingly, those who had advocated the registration and licensing of all firearms, seeing that their proposals were counterproductive to their goals, abandoned their more-sweeping proposals, and began talking about "moderate" restrictions upon handguns only.

This Member finds it significant that those who claim to favor restrictive laws only upon handguns, and to oppose restrictive laws upon rifles and shotguns, are almost unanimously opposed to the McClure-Volkmer bill's easing of restrictions upon either handguns or long guns.

Today, the principal opponents of the McClure-Volkmer reforms are saying the Nation's firearms laws shouldn't be lessened, but should be strengthened—claiming that the Gun Control Act hasn't been effective only because it wasn't strong enough.

It was because he knew that it would be ineffective that Mr. Eastland opposed the Gun Control Act.

It was because he knew the nature of the advocates of gun laws that he accurately predicted that they would cite that very failure as justification for ever-more restrictive laws.

Mr. Speaker, the McClure-Volkmer bill is unique in the annals of the gun control debate in that it suggests that a law that has failed be at least partially stricken from the books.

The opponents of the McClure-Volkmer bill suggest that the demonstrated ineffectiveness of the Gun Control Act should cause its disproven approach to be strengthened by doubling the dose of snake oil.

I urge my colleagues to join me and this distinguished bipartisan group in demanding that the House be given an opportunity to correct some of the mistakes which this body made 16 years ago.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again voice my support of the Firearms Owners Protection Act as passed by the Senate, S. 49.

It is high time that we take positive action to bring this legislation to the floor of the House so that all of our Members can have an opportunity to stand up and be counted as supporters of fair gun laws. Although I do not believe that circumventing the legislative process by using a discharge petition procedure is appropriate, our purpose today is to join together to demonstrate the strength of our commitment to the McClure-Volkmer bill, S. 49.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 has been in need of revision for years and those interested in fair and constitutional treatment of gun owners must recognize that need.

Crime and violence continue to be serious problems in our society, but simply imposing severe restrictions on gun sales is not the most effective method of dealing with the issue.

It is important to note that a study has shown that 50 percent of convicted felons who use guns said they expected to purchase guns through unregulated and illegal means when they were released. That frightening fact points out that the Gun Control Act is not reaching the very felons it is supposed to control. Fortunately, S. 51 addresses the deficiencies in the act by easing the unnecessarily restrictive regulations on lawful gun owners and collectors and also addresses the crime problem by imposing more stringent and mandatory sentencing of criminals using firearms.

I am eager to bring this bill to the floor of the House and I urge my colleagues serving on the Judiciary Committee to allow us this opportunity.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically call to the attention of my colleagues legislation currently pending in the House Judiciary Committee to bring about some much needed changes in Federal firearms law. The other body has already passed this legislation. There is a growing movement in the House to bring the Firearms Owners' Protection Act to the floor for a vote.

The gun control legislation passed by this Congress in 1968 has always been unpopular with gun owners and dealers and with good reason. It has put unnecessary restrictions on their legitimate sporting activities and in some cases has made them subject to harassment by Federal authorities. In short, the current law has had a greater effect on law-abiding citizens than it has had on criminals and this bill proposes to change that. With the passage of this act, our firearms laws will once again focus squarely on criminals and not on legitimate gunowners as has been the case in the past.

Under this bill, the prosecution would have to demonstrate that alleged violators willfully violated the law. Currently, persons who had no criminal intent at all can be prosecuted. Under this bill, gun dealers and collectors will find fewer hindrances in carrying their collections and wares across State lines for firearms shows. And most importantly, under this bill, criminals will find fewer loopholes through which to escape prosecution.

In the years since the arrival of the current administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms has made progress in redefining its proper mission and for this it is to be commended. It is important for us to ensure, though, that this progress will not be reversed in any future administration, and we can do that by making the statutory changes proposed in the Firearms Owners' Protection Act.

The chief sponsors of this bill have worked with gun control proponents and other interested parties to achieve the best compromise possible. No, not everyone is happy, but the resulting legislation now pending in the House has been carefully

crafted to reflect the concerns of both sides of the controversy and it certainly deserves more consideration than what has been promised by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition currently in the well and bring this legislation to the floor for a vote.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I have joined as a cosponsor of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act in every Congress since the 96th, when the bill was first introduced.

A number of my colleagues can also make that claim, because the Firearms Owners' Protection Act has never lacked support. In fact, in the 96th Congress, the measure had 181 cosponsors, in the 97th it had 180 cosponsors, in the 98th, 130 cosponsors, and so far in the 99th Congress, the Firearms Owners' Protection Act has 156 cosponsors.

With this large base of support, it would not be illogical to assume that some action would be taken on this legislation, which protects the rights of law-abiding citizens, while refocusing Federal law enforcement efforts toward prosecution of the criminal. Although the House Judiciary Committee recently scheduled several field hearings on gun control legislation in general, it has never held a Congressional hearing on the merits of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act.

While there is a wide difference in philosophy between the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the sponsors of the act on the emotional issue of gun control, I firmly believe that the wide-ranging support which this bill commands entitles it to a hearing where its merits can be fully debated.

The Firearms Owners' Protection Act would modify a number of provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act which have created mountains of bureaucratic redtape, or have been used by Federal officials to infringe upon the rights of law abiding firearms owners. However, contrary to what has been claimed by opponents of this bill, it would not gut the essential provisions of our current gun laws. What it does is to shift the focus of the firearms enforcement effort away from a regulatory mentality, and toward an actual law enforcement strategy aimed at the criminal.

The Senate, in July, approved the Firearms Owners' Protection Act, after approving several amendments, and I strongly feel that the House should be allowed a similar opportunity to debate this legislation. But we may not get this chance, as the bill remains bottled up in the Judiciary Committee, as it has since 1979.

The supporters of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act have been patient for 7 years, yet their patience has not been rewarded with even a hearing. For that reason, a discharge petition is being filed today to discharge House Resolution 290, the rule for the bill, from the Rules Committee, enabling the Firearms Owners' Protection Act to be brought to the floor. My name will be among the first on the discharge petition, and I would urge my col-

leagues to sign the petition and allow the Firearms Owners' Protection Act to be considered fairly and honestly in the House.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I rise today in strong support for H.R. 945, the Firearms Owners' Protection Act, and I encourage my colleagues to sign the discharge petition which has been submitted to the desk. Support for the petition will indicate Congress' desire to correct the serious problems in the Gun Control Act of 1968.

Without this petition, the proponents and opponents of this bill would be denied a fair hearing on the bill. Although the committee plans to hold field hearings on this issue during the coming weeks, the hearings will in no way be objective or fair. How can they be when a similar Senate-passed bill has been called dead on arrival by the chairman of the committee. Therefore, we need to bring this bill directly to the floor for debate and consideration. Law-abiding citizens of this country deserve nothing less than Congress' attention to this issue.

This bill would restore the Gun Control Act of 1968 to its intended purpose of curtailing criminal activity involving the misuse of firearms, but it would do it in a way which does not infringe upon the constitutionally guaranteed rights of our citizenry. This bill would remove many of the burdensome provisions which have placed restrictions on law-abiding citizens to own arms. It would allow gun owners and gun dealers to go about their everyday lives without worry and fear that they will be drug into court for some violation of existing law.

Enactment of this bill would also bring us closer to sensible enforcement of this law. Instead of concentrating on bookkeeping errors or other unintentional misapplications of existing law, the Federal Government could concentrate on blatant disregard of the law and on willful firearms law violations that lead to violent crime. The provision requiring mandatory penalties for the use of a firearm during a Federal crime will do more to deter crime than arresting and convicting a law-abiding gun owner who incorrectly fills out or files the wrong papers.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to allow a fair and objective debate on H.R. 945. It is the only way we can ensure that the law-abiding citizens of our country will have their rights protected.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Indiana, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I read an editorial that was very disturbing to me this morn-

ing on the plane coming out from Indiana. It was in the Indianapolis Star. I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of this country something that is happening that really is not being reported in the news. I will read from the editorial very briefly, and then make a comment, and then turn this back to my colleague from California:

THE SAVAGE LAND

Paul Prendergast, a Scottish engineer who said he was an eyewitness, reported that Ethiopian air force Russian-built MiG-21 and MiG-23 jets and Antonov planes dropped numerous bombs and napalm and fired rockets Sept. 20 on civilian targets in the Eritrean province of Sahel.

He said a refugee camp was attacked four times during the day, killing 29 refugees, 10 of them children, and wounding 70 other people.

Prendergast said the planes, flying over at night, also attacked a school attended by more than 2,000 children, many of them orphans, but with no casualties.

On the basis of monitored radio conversations, the engineer said, it was clear that the Ethiopian pilots intended to harm civilians and were not aiming at military personnel or material.

The pilots' conversations were monitored on FM by the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, which is fighting for Eritrean independence from Ethiopia and is believed to control 85 percent of Eritrean territory.

After the attack, Prendergast said, EPLF personnel led civilians and livestock into narrow ravines where they were less vulnerable to air attack. There are 40 refugee camps in Eritrea, all camouflaged. Children in the camps are taught to run and hide under trees and bushes at the sound of aircraft.

Prendergast's reports were corroborated by Per Nortvedt, a Norwegian nurse, and Irene Buche and Claude Pillonel, officials from the Swiss organization, Terre des Hommes, who were also in the Sahel during the attacks.

Other Ethiopian air attacks were reported on the front around the EPLF-held town of Nacfa and in the southern province of Barka, where civilians are targets and the strategy is to disrupt agricultural production, EPLF leaders said.

The bombing is expensive, each sortie costing \$13,000 and the entire air strike program costing an estimated \$250,000 a day.

In London, EPLF sources said the air attacks are made possible by the large amount of international aid to Ethiopia, which enables the ruling communist government, the Dergue, to trade coffee and other cash crops to the Soviet Union for armaments.

Now, what that means, very simply, is that the Soviet Union is buying our cash crops from the Ethiopian Government and, in return, are selling them arms with which they are killing innocent people in Ethiopia. We are all concerned about the famine there. We are all concerned about the people who are starving. But, in effect, we are indirectly subsidizing the Communist war against their own people in Ethiopia. They are not only starving their people to death, but they are using our food to get money to further kill many of those people.

Last year in Ethiopia, that Government charged us \$12.60 per ton to unload our food to feed their hungry people. They then took our food, after they received over \$5 million in port fees, they took our food and used it for their soldiers, sold much of it to the Soviet Union, and used that money to kill their own people.

The Ethiopian Communist regime has been using starvation for several years as a policy against people in the rebel provinces. It compounds irony that humanitarian aid designed to prevent death by starvation gives Ethiopian Communists the means to kill with bombs, napalm, and rockets. Of course, air attacks are quicker.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bicentennial we can do without.

Mr. Speaker, in 1785, the Dey of Algiers demanded \$53,600 as ransom for 21 Americans captured aboard two United States ships in the Mediterranean. Negotiations to secure the hostages' release were unsuccessful and they were not freed until 1796—11 years later—after payment had been made valued at \$992,463.25.

It is now 200 years later. We are supposed to be more civilized. We are supposed to respect human dignity and international law. We are supposed to settle differences through reasonable and peaceful means. But Americans are still being hijacked and held hostage on the high seas. Things haven't changed much.

Acts of terrorism are not new. The taking of the *Achille Lauro* and the murder of disabled American Leon Klinghoffer is only the latest in two centuries of barbaric attacks against innocent people. It illustrates all too vividly the relative vulnerability of all Americans. It also draws attention to the apparent inability to either predict or prepare against such acts.

Terrorism violates the civil rights of all people. It causes wanton destruction of life and property, escalates violence and incites hatreds among peoples, and undermines legitimate attempts to seek peaceful resolution of conflicts among nations. It also offends the morality of decent people everywhere. And it increases the risk of war.

But as truly evil as terrorism is, a greater tragedy lies in the awful realization that it is largely directed against innocent people. Murderous marauders of adversarial groups or nations don't just terminate each other; they terrorize, capture, wound, torture, main, kill, or merely detain innocent individuals from all walks of life and from any nation. Even war—where the legally constituted armed services of one nation can fire upon those of another—is more civilized. At least we know what to expect.

Even though the last chapter of the *Achille Lauro* incident has yet to be written, at least the United States took action to apprehend the perpetrators of this cowardly and dastardly deed and bring them, hopefully, to justice. All too often, these acts have gone unanswered and the perpetrators unpunished.

As crucial as it is that we bring these criminals to justice, we must also take care to ensure that the guilty parties are made to pay for their crimes; we must not compound the evil by taking out vengeance on innocent people. The murder on October 11 of Alex Odeh in Santa Ana, CA, serves to remind us of the senselessness of random retribution. Alex happened to be an Arab-American who tried to serve the cause of his fellow Palestinians. He did not belong to the PLO faction responsible for the ship hijacking. He was a not an advocate of terrorism. In fact, he condemned it. But he paid the ultimate price because hatred exacts revenge, not justice.

It is important to consider this last point. Justice requires the apprehension of criminals and the meting out of punishment appropriate to the crime. If armed hijackers randomly and viciously murder and throw overboard a disabled man in a wheelchair, justice is easy to identify: "catch 'em and hang 'em."

Retribution is a different matter. Retribution, if unchecked and misdirected, is another form of terrorism. It is particularly prevalent as an ongoing exchange between extremist factions in adversarial groups or nations. One violent attack leads to another. The tragedy lies in that, more often than not, the victims of both sides are innocents caught in the middle.

Americans were rightfully incensed over the murder of Leon Klinghoffer. Citizens of all nations have more than sufficient reason to detest and condemn the acts of terrorists. In this instance, the guilty party was unmistakably an extremist faction within the PLO. We should therefore direct punishment against those responsible, not go out in a fit of frenzy and blow up Palestinians at random. Just as it is wrong to kill a Jew because he is a Jew; likewise it is wrong to kill an Arab because he happens to be an Arab.

Terrorism must be dealt with swiftly and justly. Failure to do so will only perpetuate this wanton and senseless killing of which we have seen too much already.

Earlier today, this Member from California took a special order in which it was pointed out that under existing law the President of the United States has the authority to declare a national emergency with respect to acts of terrorism directed against the citizens, properties, and in-

terests of the United States. The rationale for this resolution that I have introduced is to express the sense of Congress against all terrorism and to authorize the President of the United States to investigate, determine the nature and extent of those assets and holdings in the United States of the groups, organizations, or factions responsible for committing acts of terrorism.

Third, it would prohibit transactions involving such assets and holdings in accordance with, and to the extent specified by, law.

The rationale of this move is quite simple: We in the United States are an open society. We welcome investments in this country. People can come here, invest their money, enjoy the stability of our political and economic institutions, and make a profit. That is what the free enterprise capitalistic system is all about. But we should also recognize that terrorism and terrorists around the world have declared war on American citizens. We cannot stand for that type of conduct, and I would suggest by this resolution that it would be appropriate for the U.S. Congress to declare war on these terrorists to the extent that we can reach them, namely, to reach their assets located here in the United States.

To the extent that we can reach those assets, we can take action similar to what President Carter did in 1979 against Iranian assets and hold those assets as a security fund so that persons who survive acts of terrorism will have some money damages, will have the ability to recover money damages from those assets that are held here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alex Odeh was a constituent of mine in the 39th Congressional District residing in the city of Orange. He was a 41-year-old gentleman at the time of his death. He was born on the West Bank of Palestine in the village of Jifna to a Roman Catholic family. His father, a retired grocer, still lives there. He attended universities in the West Bank area and Cairo, received a master's degree in political science at Cal State Fullerton in 1978. He worked for the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission in Los Angeles for several years. He became a U.S. citizen in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, he taught Arabic at Cal State Fullerton and also at Coastline Community College.

□ 1715

He was a member of the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission. He married his wife, Norma, in 1975. They have three daughters, Helena, Samia, and Susan. His brother, Sami, is a realtor in Orange County. He was west coast regional director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, headquartered in neighboring Santa Ana. He was assassinated

by a bomb blast on Friday morning, October 11, 1985.

So far, no group has claimed or no individual has claimed responsibility or, if you could phrase it that way, credit for this cowardly act of brutal murder. It is hoped that our authorities will be able to find those who have perpetrated this act and bring them to justice.

Members of the House may be interested to know some of the terrorists groups that have attacked U.S. citizens in the course of the recent history of our Nation. For instance, since 1968, 459 U.S. citizens have been killed in terrorist attacks. The groups that have been involved in these activities are as follows:

Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (Jordan); Tupamaro guerrillas (Uruguay); Haitian rebels; Black September (Sudan); Peoples Revolutionary Armed Forces (Mexico); Peoples Liberation Armed Forces (Mexico); January 12 Liberation Movement (Dominican Republic); Montoneros (Argentina); Zaire Peoples Revolutionary Party (Tanzania); Japanese Red Army (Malaysia); Afghan radicals (Afghanistan); Iranian radicals (Iran); M-19, (April 19 Movement) (Colombia); Red Brigade (Italy); Islamic Jihad (Lebanon, Kuwait, Greece).

Primary targets of terrorist attacks from 1968 to 1980: United States, Canada, Israel, United Kingdom, West Germany, France, Turkey, the Soviet Union.

Primary targets in 1980: The United States, the U.S.S.R. Turkey, Iraq, France, Iran, and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is the hopes of all of us that some day these acts of terrorism will cease. History teaches us that that expectation is not, perhaps, realistic; but those of us in the political institutions of America and elsewhere in the civilized world, hopefully, can take action to make clear to terrorists that there is no safe haven anywhere in this world where they can hide, the long arm of justice will seek them out and bring them to trial, where they will have the responsibility of defending themselves for their acts, where in most cases they have taken upon themselves the prerogative of snuffing out the life of a fellow citizen or destroying his property. We in the civilized world do not accept that kind of conduct. We want to condemn it wherever and by whom it is exercised.

THE DANGER OF GRAMM-RUDMAN

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction proposal can be discussed in many ways. There are many things wrong with it.

We have heard discussions of its constitutionality, discussions of its poor economics. There are numerous ways that it can be examined and found wanting. I would like to talk today about the danger of Gramm-Rudman.

The recent comment from the Nobel Prize winner in economics, Professor Modigliani I think referred to it as a Mickey Mouse proposal. I do not think it is a Mickey Mouse proposal, because I think it is far more dangerous than Mickey Mouse. It is a plot which will bring Reaganomics to the point where it always wanted to arrive, and that is, it will finish off domestic programs. The goal of Reaganomics was to shrink the Government, to get the Government out of the business of caring for the neediest people, to focus the Government, the Federal Government, wholly and exclusively on matters of defense and foreign policy, and the move to destroy the domestic programs will be consummated with this Gramm-Rudman bill. It is a complicated bill. There are numerous aspects to it. But when it all boils down, the final bottom line is that the Gramm-Rudman proposal will give the President the power to make the final decisions as to what should be cut in the budget in order to eliminate the deficit. This is the President who has never submitted a balanced budget. So we do not know exactly what he will cut, we do not know in detail what he will cut, but we do know from the budget that he has submitted which programs he is likely to cut, because those are the programs he has expressed a great dislike for, and many of these same programs he has already put zero in the budget for those programs.

We know that programs like the women's infants and children's program will be one of those targets. We know that educational programs will be one of those targets. We know that food stamps will be another one of those targets. We know the kinds of cuts that were made as a result of the process that was started in 1981 with Gramm-Latta. We know the kinds of tremendous cuts that were made early in the Reagan administration. So we have a good idea as to which programs the President will proceed to cut when he is handed these awesome powers. The victims of these programs will be children. The victims of these programs will be the handicapped, they will be the unemployed, they will be infants, they will be the aged. In these sets of categories, the unemployed, the aged, the children, one of the largest victims of course will be the minority, because they are using a disproportionate set of these programs, they bear a disproportionate set of the problems and ills of this society, they are the unemployed, the hungry, they are the needs who need the health

care provided with Government assistance, they are the ones who will be hurt most. Blacks, in particular. We have statistics to show that in the few years that the Reagan administration has been in power already, blacks, in particular, have suffered, and that there is an escalated decline of the state of affairs of black Americans in this country.

So Gramm-Rudman, if it is allowed to pass, will finish off the job that has already been done all too well. The Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction proposal has held it as an attempt to bring Government spending under control and to eliminate the deficit. It has the advantage of simplicity. But as Albert Einstein once said, "Everything should be as simple as can be, but not simpler."

A review of the Gramm-Rudman proposal makes it clear that it is simpler than can be in order to resolve the problem at hand. It has come as no surprise to the Members of this body or to any other person involved in political life that politicians like simple solutions, simple solutions which can readily be conveyed to their constituencies. They also like solutions which delay any sacrifice or hardship until after they have been re-elected.

The Gramm-Rudman proposal certainly is a very convenient device for the Members of the other body who passed it, because many of them are up for re-election. It is a very likable proposal from the perspective of their enlightened self-interest and their next re-election problems.

The pain will begin after the 1986 election. I should say the new pain, the escalation of pain for those who are already in pain will take place after 1986. The painful choices will be shifted from the Congress to the President who will not have to stand for re-election. This President will not have to stand for re-election again.

Looking at the kinds of choices that will have to be made, Gramm-Rudman suggests budget cuts to get the deficit down. Programs with many beneficiaries, such as Social Security, will not be touched. We are glad for that. We do not want to see Social Security touched. Programs with powerful beneficiaries, such as defense contractors, are not to be touched. This is a tragedy, because here is the place where most of the cuts can be made without inflicting pain on people. Programs with powerless constituencies, such as the working poor and the dependent, are to be cut at will. This cutting is to be done by the administration which has shown a marked lack of sympathy for the dependent among us. After all, children, for example, do not vote or contribute to political parties. The unemployed are also the most unorganized and, thus, they are unable to gain the attention of elected officials. Programs for these people

would therefore be made available, put on the chopping block, to save the Nation from the deficit.

There is little doubt that the deficit is a serious problem and that it must be addressed. However, shifting our responsibilities off to the executive branch hardly seems responsible or courageous. Another more honorable approach would be to take a look at alternative budgets which were worked out already by certain Members of this House. Members of this House who took a stand, they proposed cuts, and they found a way to work out the deficit. One such proposal was the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

The Black Caucus budget increased revenues and allocated budget cuts in a reasonable manner. Although it left the deficit at the same level as the House budget for 1986, it reduced that deficit to \$125.19 billion in fiscal year 1987 and to \$73.8 billion in fiscal year 1988. So the Black Caucus alternative budget, this much ignored document, is a very sound proposal which certainly did not shirk its responsibility. It addressed the deficit and it started the process of reductions. This deficit reduction approach of the Black Caucus budget did not transfer our constitutional powers to the executive branch of Government. It did not ask the weakest among us to once again shoulder the burden created by the tax cuts to the wealthy and the tax cuts to corporations, the burden that is created by the fact that many of the Fortune 500 corporations pay absolutely no taxes at all. It made the hard choices among options which competed in merit.

How did the Black Caucus find savings? Each program was evaluated to determine how savings could be made without abandoning those tasks of the Government which simply must get done. Our Federal Government exists for more than just defense and foreign policy. I do not know why this notion seems to have so much credibility, seems to be legitimized, when most of the civilized free-world countries do not accept that as the only responsibility of their National Government. Most of the civilized free-world nations are spending far more, a far greater percentage of their budget on domestic programs, on programs for people, on education, on programs for the aged, on programs for health. Most of them are spending far more, a far greater percentage of their budget, than the United States of America. This very rich country wants to turn away from the very important task of taking care of those in need, and not just those in need, but taking care of the populace in general.

I take a back seat to no one in being concerned about the defense of this country, both in the short term, the short range, or the long range. The defense of this country is not dependent

on how many contracts we can award to defense contractors, how many new MX missiles we can build. It is not dependent on how we let our military run wild and pay enormous amounts for spare parts. The defense of our country is as much dependent on our educational system and the kinds of products that we produce, the pool of talent, the brainpower of this Nation, is as important to the short-term and long-term defense as any contract we could ever award for any new weapon system.

So a neglect of these aspects of the Federal responsibility, the kind of neglect which is escalating and which has been rampant in this administration, serves as a danger, it is a danger to our national defense.

But the Black Caucus, being concerned about national defense, in its alternative budget looks at the area of national defense.

For fiscal year 1986, the House had proposed, the House final proposal, \$267.1 billion; the other body proposed \$273.1 billion for defense. Our caucus budget was \$261.5 billion, not too far, not too great a range in the difference between the caucus alternative budget of \$261.5 billion and the House-passed budget of \$267.1 billion.

The bulk of the caucus savings were in the area of procurement and allowances function. Given the problems which have occurred in the Department of Defense and the criticisms of the Department's staunchest allies in the other body, it is more than reasonable to question the procurements which have consumed billions of dollars without making our military forces able to better serve their function in our society. A military is not supposed to be a separate entity which performs any function other than those which are constitutionally mandated. It is not, as in other countries, an institution from which one can expect to derive wealth and power. The Armed Forces is not created for that purpose. The military budget for contracts is not for that purpose. It is there for national defense, which is to be utilized at the behest of the civilian authorities. The military which Americans take pride in is one which serves our population, our civilian population, not one which is a cause for draining resources from that population.

The next budget function which the Black Caucus made significant savings in was the energy expenditures. Expenditures for energy supplies were significantly reduced while funds for energy conservation were increased slightly.

□ 1730

The overall totals in that budget were \$5.75 billion in the budget passed by the House; \$5.1 billion in the

budget of the other body; and \$3.2 billion in the caucus budget. We showed how you could save money and at the same time we actually increased the funds for energy conservation.

In the commerce and housing credit budget function the House budget called for \$4.6 billion. The other body for \$3.4 billion. But the caucus budget reduced it to \$2.8 billion. Savings were achieved by cuts in the non-FHA and the GNMA mortgage credit and thrift insurance programs and the Postal Service function.

Additional deficit reduction measures were calculated based on increased revenues. Like it or not, the practical reality is that a budget can only be balanced through decreased expenditures, increased income or a combination of the two approaches. When viewing the policy behind the Federal programs, it makes no sense to cripple a program and to stop the function if one believes that the policy rationale for the program's creation still exists.

Since, as a general rule, expenditures tend to benefit those with the least cuts on this side of the equation, it requires that we stop assistance to the most dependent segments of our population: The poor, the very young, the old, and those who are disabled. Increased revenues, in contrast, come through the taxation of those who are more affluent and hence more capable of shouldering this burden.

It should not escape our attention that a great deal of the deficit came about by a combination of reduction in revenues and increased expenditures for defense. Both happening at the same time as a part of Reaganomics. Americans were promised a military buildup exceeding the buildup associated with the Vietnam war. They were also promised that they would not be asked to shoulder any additional burden to achieve this end. Although the probability of this happening was low, people chose to believe that they could, as a nation, spend more than their income without any further debt problems. This proved not to be true, of course.

When President Reagan came into office, the national debt after almost 200 years of constitutional government was under \$1 trillion. Now we are about to have a national debt of over \$2 trillion. The "Buy now, pay later" approach has come home to roost and we have to begin to start paying our debts.

At the same time, we must maintain those services which our view of ourselves demands. We are not a nation which wants to be known for its poor, its hungry and its homeless. We do not want to be a nation which ignores the needs of the elderly, the young and the disabled among us. Even as a family coming out of debt does not start to cut expenditures by eliminat-

ing essentials such as food, we as a nation cannot eliminate those essentials which define us in our own eyes and in the eyes of others.

Americans consider themselves to be a fair, honest, hardworking people. That view is well founded in our history and our social fabric. As we strive to find a solution for the deficit problem, and the burden that it will necessarily place on future generations, we must do so in a way that is fair and honest. This may be the easiest way to proceed, but it is the only way that we can if we are to remain proud of ourselves and of our Nation. The one way not to proceed is to proceed as Gramm-Rudman is proceeding. The one way not to proceed is to hand over enormous powers to the executive branch of Government, to hand the responsibilities of the Congress over to the executive branch of government to give up the time-honored concept of a separation of powers and to proceed to allow the executive branch of government to complete its agenda and that agenda is to get government out of the business of taking care of the people in greatest need. To do that would be a disaster indeed, and we should recognize Gramm-Rudman as being that kind of plot. It will accomplish that purpose.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and I appreciate this latest in his demonstrated concern for the poorest people of this country.

Those of us who are opposed to the version of Gramm-Rudman that passed the other body and came over here have two sets of concerns. One is constitutional, from the standpoint of the role of the Congress in the U.S. Government, the Gramm-Rudman proposal probably ought to be called the "Emasculation Proclamation," because it is a decision by the other body simply to divest itself from responsibility for the budget deficits.

A number of people have commented and will comment on its glaring structural flaws. It is particularly ironic that many who call themselves conservatives, and conservatives have historically in this country worried about excessive executive power, about an insufficiency of power remaining in the elected legislative body, it is extraordinary how that has fled in the exigencies of the moment. It is a reason why people like George Will and others who are on the conservative side have been so appalled by the Gramm-Rudman proposal.

There is, however, another equally distressing aspect of it which the gentleman from New York has talked about, and that is the extent to which Gramm-Rudman, as passed by the other body, would inflict enormous harm on innocent, vulnerable people.

Beginning in 1981, at the urging of the President, one thing ought to be clear when we talk about reducing the deficit. If the Congress had substituted none of its own judgment for that of the President, if Congress had simply done everything the President asked us to do, the deficit today would be virtually identical to what it is.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who is now the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, has totaled it up, and Ronald Reagan had asked Congress to spend virtually identical to what Congress has spent. That ought to be clear, because the difference between us is not over whether or not we reduce the deficit, but how we do it.

Ronald Reagan has asked Congress to spend virtually the same amount, \$100 or \$200 million less than has been spent out of a \$2,700,000,000 amount. So we are talking about virtually the same amount of spending. The difference is in how we spend it. What Gramm-Rudman does as it comes to us is to say that the MX missile is exempt. We should not cut any MX missiles despite the fact that we have now adopted in Congress a compromise that virtually admits that it has no real military necessity. But we are still going to go ahead and spend billions on that, but we will cut medical care for the elderly poor, that is Gramm-Rudman.

Gramm-Rudman says cut medical care for the elderly poor under Medicaid, which is not protected and not exempt, but exempt the MX missile. Contracts in the Pentagon, all of the abuses people have read about, the excesses, the overcharges, those are exempt from fiscal discipline under Gramm-Rudman's automatic provision, but the program of Women's and Infant's Children's feeding, that is not exempt.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that President Reagan has submitted budget requests very nearly identical to what the Congress has actually spent. That is a matter of record. My question to the gentleman is: Does the gentleman from Massachusetts honestly think that had the President submitted requests that were substantially lower, in fact that would have balanced the budget, that this Congress and prior Congresses would have gone along with those requests?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his reply.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Texas and I commend his intellectual honesty. We have now stipulated what is in fact the fact, and people

should not take for granted that Members of Congress would admit the facts. We do not always do that, so I congratulate the gentleman from Texas.

But we now agree, there has been no difference between the President and Congress and what should be spent. He asked me, would we have asked for less? I will say to him "Yes."

□ 1740

I do not think Congress on its own would, for instance, have funded the Pentagon at the level that the Pentagon is funded. Congress would not have come up with Radio Marti. I voted for Radio Marti. I believe that we ought to be engaging in free speech elsewhere. But at a time of crisis, at a time when we are saying to poor pregnant women we will cut the food that you get to keep the likelihood that you will have healthy children, that is what Gramm-Rudman does. Broadcasting political soap operas to Cuba is a lower order of priority.

So I think that if the President had not pushed us in some of these areas, yes, we would have spent so much.

We have the National Endowment for Democracy. That is a new program. It had some support in here and in the other body and it had support from the President. The National Endowment for Democracy is a travel service for politicians. It sends American politicians to Europe. It sends Asian politicians to America. It sends politicians all over the place so we can talk about how wonderful democracy is. And it sure is wonderful if you are getting your trips paid for all over the place to go and talk about it.

And then you are going to turn around and you are going to cut chapter 1. Do you know what chapter 1 is? It is a program that began in the sixties and has been supported by conservatives and liberals alike, Democrats and Republicans alike. It tries to provide educational assistance to poor children who are not learning well. That is subject to cuts under Gramm-Rudman. Chapter 1 would be subject to cuts under Gramm-Rudman; but not the MX missile, not the \$700 toilet seats.

We are not talking about the desirability of cutting the budget deficit. Of course, we should.

I would ask, if the gentleman would continue to yield to me, if I could just introduce some material into the Record at this point and let me enumerate what I would like to put in.

Our colleague, Mr. SABO, has asked me to submit the recent statement of the Conference of Synodical Bishops of the Lutheran Church in America on Gramm-Rudman. All 29 of the bishops have signed it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues to the recent statement of the Conference of Syn-

odical Bishops of the Lutheran Church in America on the Gramm-Rudman amendment. This statement was signed by all 29 of the bishops and expresses some very important points. I recommend it to my colleagues for their serious attention.

STATEMENT OF THE CONFERENCE OF SYNODICAL BISHOPS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA ON THE GRAMM-RUDMAN AMENDMENT

The Conference of Synodical Bishops of the Lutheran Church in America, meeting in Washington this week, was briefed on the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget amendment. We, the undersigned bishops of the LCA, are deeply troubled by this amendment's potentially devastating impact on the federal programs which provide for the basic needs of the poor.

Together with all of the bishops of the American Lutheran Church and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, we asserted earlier this year that: "Our deficit dilemma has no painless solutions. However, the sacrifice required must be distributed in accordance with the ability of individuals and groups to bear it. The allocation of limited resources should be based on a thorough evaluation of the utility and effectiveness of tax breaks, military spending and social programs."

The action the Senate has just taken seriously compromises that principle.

Automatic reductions in cost-of-living adjustments and across-the-board cuts in discretionary programs, triggered if Congress fails to reach its deficit reduction targets, seem on the surface to be a fair way to spread the pain of deficit reduction. However, with Social Security, a large percentage of defense spending, other relatively uncontrollable programs, and interest on the national debt "off the table," the heaviest burden for reducing the deficit falls on the remaining half of the budget. Budget authority for some programs, such as subsidized housing for the poor, elderly and handicapped, would have to be cut back drastically to achieve the mandated outlay savings. Other programs, such as food stamps and Aid to Families With Dependent Children, could experience significant reductions—a move which we cannot countenance given the documentation of widespread and persistent hunger in America.

The proposed amendment would not require an evaluation of the revenue side of the budget ledger, should deficit reduction targets remain unmet. Tax expenditures contribute significantly to the deficit and are expected to increase by \$192 billion between fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1989. Failure to evaluate both actual spending and tax expenditures could result in such anomalies as low-income housing programs being cut through automatic reductions while real estate tax shelters remain unscrutinized.

You will be considering very serious issues relating to the amendment's impact on the economy and on the balance of White House-Congressional budgetary power. But as church leaders, whose congregations and agencies assist persons in need throughout the country, we would urge you also to make concern for the poor a priority in your deliberations. Specifically, we urge you to exempt from the automatic reductions low-income entitlement and discretionary programs as you develop a process which would more equitably spread the burden of reducing the deficit.

Mr. FRANK. It says, "We, the undersigned bishops"—I am reading now. I have not become a bishop in the interim—"are deeply troubled by this amendment's potentially devastating impact on the federal programs which provide for the basic needs of the poor."

The U.S. Catholic Conference signed by Rev. J. Bryan Hehir. This in on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference, the hierarchy of the church.

U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE, OFFICE OF DOMESTIC SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Washington, DC, October 16, 1985.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the United States Catholic Conference I am writing to call your attention to the likely negative impact on the poor of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget amendment.

As the House begins deliberations on this proposal, we urge you to give careful consideration to the far-reaching consequences a balanced budget plan may have on programs that provide basic necessities for the poor. Over the past four years, reductions in low-income programs have been deeper than the cuts in virtually any other area of the budget. Millions of families have been severely affected by these budget cuts.

The budget deficit is a massive and serious problem. We encourage you to continue to explore responsible ways to reduce the deficit. We believe, however, that additional cutting in programs for the poor is not an acceptable method of dealing with the problem. The basic needs of the poor must take precedence over other areas of the budget that are less fundamental to the protection of human dignity. Therefore, as you craft a plan to reduce the federal deficit, we urge you to exempt low-income programs (e.g., Food Stamps, Medicaid, AFDC, SSI, low-income housing) from any further cuts. We are also concerned about the potentially adverse impact of Gramm-Rudman on foreign aid programs that help the poor in the developing countries, programs which we have consistently supported.

Thank you for consideration of these views.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. J. BRYAN HEHIR.

Mr. FRANK. "I am writing to call your attention to the likely negative impact on the poor of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget amendment."

The American Jewish Committee similarly opposing this.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS,

New York, NY, October 15, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the House of Representatives considers the bill to raise the national debt ceiling, the American Jewish Committee is concerned that an amendment may be attached to this legislation aimed at reducing the deficit by cutting programs in arbitrary or unplanned ways. We believe that issues like budget reduction and program cuts are serious matters that need to be considered carefully. They should not be rushed through the legislative process with-

out adequate opportunity to evaluate their provisions and implications for key policy concerns—and without the thoughtful process required for a fundamental change in executive-Congressional relations.

We recognize the urgent need to reduce the Federal deficit and bring spending under control. We can understand the desire of Congress to place itself on record in favor of eliminating unacceptable federal deficits. We believe it ill-advised, however, to seize upon the necessity to pass a higher debt ceiling to introduce a potential major shift in the balance of executive-legislative budget responsibilities and to open the door to possible wholesale program cuts whose effects have not been adequately studied. We urge the House to pass a debt ceiling bill that does not include the Gramm-Rudman amendment that was accepted by the Senate. If a budget-balancing provision is considered necessary, it should come only after a full discussion of its consequences.

We look forward to working with you to identify responsible and constructive ways to reduce the deficit and implement national programs in an efficient manner.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. GORDIS,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. FRANK. I would like to further submit letters from the Child Welfare League of America, and from the Consortium for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, NY, October 15, 1985.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) and its 350 member agencies and 1,200 affiliates throughout this country who provide a range of services to children and families in crisis, I am writing to express our deep concern about the Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget Amendment passed by the Senate last week.

While we too are concerned about projected deficits, we do not believe that the Gramm-Rudman Amendment achieves the goal of deficit reduction in a fair, equitable, nor, for that matter, effective manner. Specifically:

We oppose the provision of Gramm-Rudman exempting that portion of the defense budget which is covered by prior year contracts and obligations. Such contracts and obligations account for approximately 40% of the total defense budget and, in fairness, should be considered as part of any base used to compute automatic spending reductions. The defense budget has received huge increases over the past five years and in large measure is responsible for our current deficit. Therefore, it is only fair that the defense budget fully shoulder its share of automatic spending reductions in any attempt to reduce the deficit or balance the Federal budget.

Given that 40% of the defense budget, Social Security and interest payments on the national debt would all be exempt from automatic spending reductions, the burden for reducing the deficit and balancing the budget will fall disproportionately on programs serving children and low income families. These programs have already contributed to reducing the deficit by absorbing more than \$10 billion a year in cuts since 1981. We, therefore, urge you to specifically exempt discretionary and entitlement programs serving children and low income persons during House-Senate Conference nego-

tiations on the Gramm-Rudman amendment.

Any effort to balance the budget and eliminate deficits should allow the inclusion of new revenues from taxes. Recent tax breaks for corporations and wealthy individuals rather than expenditures for children and low income families have significantly contributed to the current deficit. Moreover, it is not certain that if the entire non-defense discretionary portion of the budget were totally eliminated that the Federal budget would be balanced. New revenues must be allowed in any plan aimed at reducing the deficit.

Congress must not relinquish its authority and responsibility in making budget decisions. Considerable discretion is provided to the President and to the Office of Management and Budget under Gramm-Rudman in deciding whether or not to make automatic spending reductions and, in the case of OMB, in allocating reductions, possibly down to the line item. This may be one of the more serious elements of the Gramm-Rudman in its long-term implications regarding future national budget policy in that Congress could effectively be overturned in its budget decisions by allowing the President the ultimate authority in this regard.

CWLA urges your serious consideration of these issues as well as your consideration of whether to move forward with a balanced budget package at this time. The Gramm-Rudman amendment is barely two-weeks old; it has not been subject to committee scrutiny or deliberation in either the House or the Senate; and, it has far-reaching implications for the future of our national budget process. It deserves, therefore, a more thoughtful and deliberate consideration than can possibly be provided in the next week and a half.

Such consideration is particularly important given that, as currently proposed, Gramm-Rudman would be devastating for programs serving children and low-income families. Unfortunately, these populations are least able to provide you with their analysis of this proposal and they, therefore, rely on your judgment and wisdom for their protection. CWLA urges you to keep in mind the children who would be adversely affected by Gramm-Rudman as you decide how you will vote on the matter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVID S. LIEDERMAN,
Executive Director.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS
WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES,
October 18, 1985.

DEAR CONFERE: The Consortium for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (CCDD) wishes to express our outrage about the budget deficit reduction plan authored by Senators Gramm and Rudman and currently under consideration in conference by the House and Senate.

CCDD is comprised of national organizations, including the undersigned, who work on behalf of our country's citizens with the most severe disabilities. Although persons with developmental disabilities frequently have unmet needs, many have available to them some basic Federal supports through Federal/State programs and personal entitlements. These supports allow them to have a roof over their heads, food, medical assistance, and special education and training programs aimed at helping them become more independent and productive citizens.

During many years of strong bipartisan support, members of both Houses have worked valiantly to develop and maintain these vital services and benefits, which are now so seriously threatened.

We have two major objections to the Gramm-Rudman Amendments as we understand them. First, the current Congressional procedures for budget approval would be radically changed, placing sweeping authority in the hands of the Executive Branch. The future of our services and our people would be that much more at risk. CCDD wishes to express its dismay over this possibility, and strongly urge Congress to work to retain its current authority over the budget process. In this way, people with developmental disabilities will maintain their opportunity to share their views and concerns with their elected representatives and not to have the quality of their lives decided by the Office of Management and Budget.

Secondly, CCDD is particularly concerned that a substantial portion of the budget cuts required by Gramm-Rudman will likely result in massive curtailment of services and benefits to persons with developmental disabilities. None of the programs geared to protect and improve the lives of our people are protected. Yet, citizens with developmental disabilities are among our most vulnerable populations. What will happen to them in FY'91 when programs like vocational rehabilitation, special education, Medicaid and others are slashed beyond recognition? We urge you to exempt Federal programs serving people with developmental disabilities from the cutbacks envisioned under Gramm-Rudman.

CCDD does realize that deficit reduction is an important national priority. It must be done to keep our nation strong. We implore you to do all you can to find effective avenues other than gutting handicapped and other human services programs. Surely there are ways to raise substantial additional revenues to reduce the deficit. Surely, a greater proportion of the defense budget can be scrutinized for possible reductions.

Persons with developmental disabilities, their families and advocates, are becoming very fearful that their dreams for independence will soon end if Gramm-Rudman is enacted. These people have enough problems facing them in their everyday lives without having to worry about what the Congress might do to their benefits and services. We strongly urge you to reflect carefully on the impact of your decisions on the lives of persons with developmental disabilities.

On behalf of: American Academy of Child Psychiatry, American Occupational Therapy Association, American Physical Therapy Association, Association for Children and Adults With Learning Disabilities, Association for Retarded Citizens, Council for Exceptional Children, Epilepsy Foundation of America, National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, National Association of Private Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children, National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, National Association of State Mental Retardation Program Directors, National Easter Seal Society, National Education Association, National Mental Health Association, National Network to Prevent Birth Defects, National Recreation and Park Association, National Society for Children and Adults with Autism, the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., the Center for Law and Social Policy.

Mr. FRANK. I would like to submit articles by Evans and Novak, Hobart Rowen, George Will, and Haynes Johnson, a fairly representative selection of people.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1985]

GOVERNMENT BY MEAT CLEAVER
(By George F. Will)

Bob Dole, illustrating the axiom that wit is educated insolence, said the Senate should pass the radical budget-balancing bill without hearings because, "The longer something hangs around here, it gets stale. People start reading it." Heaven forbid.

The proposal, an action-forcing device, would require five annual cuts of equal size (\$36 billion) bringing the deficit to zero in 1991. The president would be required to submit a budget with sufficient spending cuts or tax increases to cut \$36 billion from the deficit. If—if—Congress did not ratify his blend of pains and did not devise its own blend, the failure would trigger a presidential duty to cut spending, across the board, by what fixed percentage is required.

Note that congressional failure to make hard choices would not invest the president with broad power to exercise rational discretion in shaping the budget. Defenders—yes, defenders—of the proposal stress that it makes the president a mere automaton. The proposal minimizes choice—thought—in budget-making. This evasion of governance might, for example, require the president to cut equally, thereby assigning the same social value to Amtrak subsidies and programs for spina-bifida babies.

This proposal is historic in its potential consequences and stunning in its symbolism, especially as it reveals a transformation of conservatism. In its potential for large consequences, it ranks a cut below repeal of the Missouri Compromise. It will not ignite civil war, quite. However, as an allocator of effective power within the central government, the proposal is as significant as the establishment of the Federal Reserve System.

Considering its source—the conservative party—the proposal is as startling as the Giles Enforcement Act of 1809, which suspended parts of the Bill of Rights in order to enforce compliance with Jefferson's embargo against Britain and France. Sen. William B. Giles, the author of this concentration of irresistible power in the central government, was a Virginia Jeffersonian, at least rhetorically.

Today's conservative proposal for shrinking deficits mocks some conservative rhetoric. It would involve an enlargement of executive-branch power without parallel in peacetime. Modern conservatism defined itself in opposition first to FDR and then to LBJ. Hence conservatism has celebrated congressional prerogatives against "presidential government." But conservatives supporting this deficit-cutting proposal favor a form of executive power far beyond the dreams of liberal political avarice.

We few who are "strong government conservatives"—we Hamiltonians—believe, as our hero did, that "energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of good government." But minimizing the element of mind in governance is a high price to pay for instilling energy in the executive.

The proposal illuminates the real, as distinct from the rhetorical, nature of contemporary conservatism. Social Security would be completely exempt from cuts. Social Security and interest payments, which are necessarily exempt, comprise one-third of the budget. All other entitlement programs

would suffer only cuts from annual cost-of-living increases. Thus the controllable portion of the defense budget, especially pay, maintenance and operations, would bear a heavy burden of the cuts. So conservatives supporting the proposal are siding with the middle-class, social-insurance side of the central government against the defense priority.

The proposal is as American as, well, Prohibition. It expresses a deep desire to tame turbulent social forces with institutional cleverness and words on parchment. Deficits a problem? Outlaw the rascals—that worked so well with gin.

It is axiomatic: In politics, the perfect is the enemy of the good. That is, pursuant of perfection impedes achievement of the merely adequate. Perhaps today's proposal is the closest that self-government, modern American-style, can come to self-restraint. But as Dole said to a supporter of the proposal, "Don't get up and explain it again. Some of us are for it."

Congressional pleas for the proposal sound like the notes the homicidal maniac sends to the police: "Stop me before I kill (spend) again!" Sen. Warren Rudman (R-N.H.), an author of the proposal, was an amateur boxer. He combines charming feistiness with disarming candor. He does not cavil about a description of the proposal as a straitjacket for the government to jump into in a fleeting moment of lucidity. But the words of Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.), a critic of the proposal, can be quoted by proponents for the proposal. Bradley says Congress does not need new procedures, it just lacks political will. Just? "The brain surgeon just lacked steady hands."

The proposal calls to mind an acid cartoon from the late 1940s showing a German general saying, "I was only obeying orders I gave to myself." The proposal would hand a meat cleaver to the executive branch and force the use of it. Then a congressman or senator confronted by angry constituents could point to the executive branch and say: "Don't blame me. The, er, government did it."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 17, 1985]

VOODOO BUDGET PROPOSALS WON'T CURE
REAGAN'S DEFICITS
(By Hodding Carter III)

The proposal by Sens. Gramm, Rudman and Hollings controlling and then eliminating the federal deficit is brilliant politics and appalling governance. It makes a mockery of the separation of powers, stands constitutional and political responsibilities on their heads, and makes policy decisions by arbitrary formula rather than by a rational decision-making process. In other words, it accurately reflects the realities of Washington 1985. A bad idea whose time has come, it could well finally force responsibility upon those who have been resisting it like the plague for far too long.

The problem all along has been that no one would bite the multiple fiscal bullets that face the nation with lethal peril. Congress and President Reagan spent almost eight months wrestling with the budget, then "compromised" on a resolution that was divorced from reality when passed and has grown more distant from the truth of the situation ever since. It promises deficit reductions it can't deliver, based on economic projections no one accepts.

It's not that anyone disputes some basic points. The annual deficit has quadrupled over the past five years, now averaging \$200

billion-plus each year. Thanks to the structural imbalances between tax base and spending so carefully created by then-Rep. Phil Gramm and company in the 1981 tax bill, there would be large deficits under the best of circumstances, so long as the president insists upon using national defense as the world's largest pork-barrel project. The circumstances, of course, were something less than the best for about half of President Reagan's five years in office.

And so the national debt—that sum of money we liberals once liked to say that Americans "owe ourselves"—has grown astronomically, fed by ever burgeoning deficits. From one trillion five years ago, it has doubled to two trillion dollars. Given annual deficits of \$200 billion, give or take a few billions, by realistic projections it should reach three trillion by 1990. That money we "owe ourselves" is increasingly owed to others, and the transfer of national wealth from productive purposes to debt service can have only dire long-term results. It will sap the country's economic vitality and drive business and industry into permanent stagnation—or it will prompt the government to print its way out of one mess and into another.

So much for the obvious. Today, virtually no one disagrees that huge debt and large annual deficits are intolerable. But since the real pain and harsh consequences are in the hazy future, neither legislators nor the president has felt compelled to inflict tax or budgetary pain on their constituents in the here and now.

Into that vacuum came the appealing simplicities of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. What the White House and Congress would not do for themselves, through hard choices among program options, the *deus ex machina* of annual, mandatory, across-the-board reductions would impose. All matters would be treated as though they were of equal worth, whatever their starting point and their utility. The just and the unjust alike would take the budget-reduction blow (save only that great untouchable, Social Security). Bloated or lean, each budget item would be cut by the same percentage to reach the pre-specified annual overall reduction.

And who would do the cutting? In the political sense, no one. If Congress and the president were unable to come up with a budget that reduced the deficit by the preestablished figure, then the act's unseen hand would take the president by the neck and force him to make the blanket cuts. Everyone would be to blame, and no one.

So much for sarcasm. Dangerously flawed, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings performs a major public service. It throws into clear relief the utter irresponsibility of both houses of Congress and the president. It exposes the collapse of the budget process, which meets its goals only by fudging them. It demonstrates that behind all the public protestations of concern about the deficits and the debt at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue lies a great swamp of indifference. Finally, it creates a monster whose Frankenstein-style depredations should finally force consensus on intelligent alternatives to arbitrary, mechanical budget making by formula.

The matter is now before an extraordinarily large conference committee, the House having decided to put into a huddle rather than try to advance the ball on the open field of play. As members of Congress read deeper and think more clearly, they may all find various reasons to alter the version of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings that the Senate passed. But some version will almost surely

emerge, thanks to a fine mix of political shrewdness and political cowardice.

At that point, it seems clear to me that no one will actually find it possible to live with the measure over any length of time. Certainly not the president, who would be required to cut deeply into defense spending along with social programs. Not liberal and moderate congressmen, who would have to watch from the sidelines as the poor were even more severely penalized for their poverty. And not those in both houses who believe that Congress should be a live participant in the business of government rather than a mute observer of some clockwork process.

In short, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings will, like the executioner's ax, wonderfully concentrate the minds of those we have elected to represent us. Faced with the most unpleasant choice of all, which is to admit their irrelevance to the political process, they may finally make the hard choices and trade-offs necessary to confront the implications of our national sea of red ink. Having taken us into that sea up to our necks due to the economic policy mistakes of 1981 and beyond, they should finally be persuaded by their own legislative creature that they have the ability to repair them.

If that is wrong and if Gramm-Rudman-Hollings is called into play, it will fundamentally alter the shape of government and amend the Constitution through the back door. In that respect, it is a radical threat to our political system. But so, too, are the implications of the monstrous national debt. Given both, the president and Congress should finally be stirred to stop playing games and start meeting their basic responsibilities.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1985]

WHAT GRAMM/RUDMAN WILL REALLY COST

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

By the time their guffaws over the discomfiture of Democrats caught in the act of hypocrisy had subsided, senior aides to President Reagan began totaling up the cost of the Gramm/Rudman deficit-reduction plan. A possibly fatal slowdown of tax reform is only the down payment. Threatened in the immediate future are Reagan's rearmament program and his pledge not to increase taxes. That endangers the sustained economic growth that would truly shrink the deficit.

Sober second thoughts abound in the West Wing of the White House, where Gramm/Rudman looks more and more like Dave Stockman's revenge. Stockman left the Office of Management and Budget after a final failure to raise taxes as an alternative to unobtainable spending cuts. Suddenly, he is on the verge of victory in absentia.

Nothing seemed further from reality when Sen. Phil Gramm's brainchild emerged, enabling Republicans to regain the budget offensive. After a solid year of complaining about the Reagan deficit, Democrats were faced with further assault on cherished social welfare programs.

But the Reagan Revolution will have to pay as well. As a starter, Gramm/Rudman may administer the *coup de grace* to Stockman's pet peeve: tax reform. Chairman Dan Rostenkowski and other members of the House Ways and Means Committee must lay aside tax-writing to serve on the conference committee to forge a deficit reduction.

Considering today's negative climate within Ways and Means, postponing tax reform could prove remedial. But the renewed primacy of deficit reduction dulls the

appeal of a tax bill mistakenly hawked by the White House as an instrument of "fairness" rather than economic growth.

Nearly as immediate but more profound is the impact on budget-making. Although the budget need not be balanced until 1991 under Gramm/Rudman, the OMB must begin immediate preparation of Reagan's most Draconian budget. To limit the deficit to \$147 billion, it must far outdo Stockman's last rejected efforts at dismantling the Great Society. Politically astute aides at the White House see this Parthian shot at big government as fine for the lame-duck president but suicidal for Republican politicians in 1986.

In fact, the danger transcends partisan politics. As Congress predictably refuses to cut domestic spending, Reagan would be faced a year from now with mandated cuts—eventually spread between defense and nondefense.

The problem here has been publicly laid out by Treasury Secretary James Baker, scarcely a mad bomber of defense spending. He acknowledges that the military cutbacks he unsuccessfully advocated in 1981 have been forced by Congress and that there is no margin for further reduction if the Reagan rearmament is to be preserved. Yet, it is clear to Baker that Gramm/Rudman will require just such defense slicing.

The escape from this dilemma is via the path long advocated by Stockman: tax increases. The argument that will be made to Ronald Reagan next year is obvious; Mr. President, if you want to save your military budget, you must acquiesce in a little "revenue adjustment."

Since tax increases depress economic activity, this could dash private Treasury projections of a budget close to balance by 1991 simply by economic growth. Thus, what Gramm sees as the salvation of the Reagan Revolution may ruin it.

Gramm, a rising Republican star, is an intrepid champion of military preparedness and the free market. But he sees the Reagan Revolution as a "defunding" of federal programs with which he believes the Democrats have bought political victory.

Gramm is fully supported by chief of staff Donald Regan, but heavy doubts have infiltrated the West Wing and the House Republican cloakroom. Silent dissenters are hoping the Democrats will somehow derail the deficit-reduction juggernaut, signifying that the political budget game has gone full circle.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1985]

GRAMM/RUDMAN IS PURE MISCHIEF

(By Hobart Rowen)

Of all of the indictments of the Gramm/Rudman budget-deficit proposal—and there are many—one of the most effective was delivered by former Economic Council chairman Walter W. Heller: it is bad, almost horrible, economic policy.

Unhappily, Heller's testimony to the Joint Economic Committee got lost as national media attention was focused on the Navy's splendid intercept of the Egyptian airliner trying to take those four Palestinian hijackers to safety.

The proposal by Republican Sens. Phil Gramm of Texas and Warren Rudman of New Hampshire would require a balanced budget by fiscal year 1991 and, in the interim, would trigger automatic spending reductions of \$36 billion each year. This seductive, simplistic notion is supposed to satisfy the yearning of Republicans and Democrats alike to "do something" about the budget

deficit, in the same thoughtless fashion that Congress has been asked to "do something" about the trade deficit by passing counterproductive protectionist import surcharges.

Said Heller: "Like any mandated and rigid formula, it would undermine, perhaps even pervert, the role of the federal budget as an economic balance wheel in the economy. Rigid reductions of the deficit through thick and thin—through recovery and recession—could wreak havoc on the economy."

For example, suppose a recession hits the economy in 1987 (which many economists think quite possible), but is followed by a modest recovery in 1988. Under terms of the Gramm/Rudman bill, the federal deficit in fiscal 1988 would not be allowed to exceed \$108 billion, which is a smashing \$162 billion less than the \$270 billion now forecast by the Congressional Budget Office for such a 1987-88 economic scenario.

Says Heller: "Imagine the economic setback it would cause to slash spending and the deficit by 1988 to try to reach the \$108 billion deficit level fixed by the Gramm/Rudman formula!"

Obviously, it couldn't be done. If in that circumstance the president actually tried to find the \$162 billion by raising taxes or by forcing cuts in spending, it would further depress the economy, throwing more people out of work and throwing the budget even more out of whack. "A dog chasing its own tail comes to mind," Heller said.

Or let's say that the economy faces a "growth" recession, like the one it's been in for the past year—no negative result in GNP, but not enough growth, either, to cut the unemployment rate. Over a two-year period, that would cost about \$60 billion in tax revenue that otherwise would be received by the Treasury. And in that case, Gramm/Rudman would not only require that \$72 billion be cut from the deficit (\$36 billion a year for two years), but enough to make up for the \$60 billion shortfall.

Heller, a good phrase-maker (who is sorely missed here) snaps: "... that would simply kick the economy in the groin and bring on an actual recession."

But sadly, a passel of veteran "liberal" Senate Democrats was played for suckers by junior Republicans Gramm and Rudman. They weren't paying attention to the economic-policy shortcomings of the proposal, but to the political benefits of being seen as willing to "do something" about the deficit. And in doing so, they fell into a neat trap, transferring authority to President Reagan to do whatever he wants, unilaterally, with the nondefense part of the budget. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, at least half of the budget would be exempted from the Gramm/Rudman cuts.

Among 27 Democrats who abandoned, almost everything they've ever said they stood for on economic issues was Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, who has been trying to carve out a more "responsible" image looking to the 1988 presidential election. Said Kennedy: "We are all crying 'fire' in the overcrowded theater of the federal deficit. We cannot continue to debate endlessly which fire extinguisher to use while the fire rages on. 'Since low-income programs would bear the brunt of the automatic \$36 billion annual reductions, Kennedy's rationale is somewhat reminiscent of the U.S. military officer at Ben Tre during the Vietnam War who said: 'It became necessary to destroy the town in order to save it.'"

Sens. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.) and Gary Hart (D-Colo.) argue convincingly that—in short—Gramm/Rudman is a fraud, cleverly

designed to protect the defense program from more than token cuts; to avoid a tax increase; and to lay the entire burden of cutting the deficit on monies for education, child care, environmental and other nondefense programs that so far have partially eluded the ax of Reaganomics.

It's now up to House Democrats in conference to rescue the nation from the worst of the Gramm/Rudman mischief.

Mr. FRANK. And I would like to submit a memorandum by the Children's Defense Fund and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

POOR CHILDREN MUST NOT BE SACRIFICED—AGAIN: GRAMM/RUDMAN MUST EXEMPT ALL PROGRAMS FOR THE POOR

America's poor children have already paid, and paid dearly, to reduce our nation's budget deficit. In 1981, poor children were sent to the frontlines of the deficit reduction war, and federal programs for them and their families were reduced by over \$10 billion a year. The Gramm/Rudman amendment to the federal debt ceiling legislation (H.J. Res. 372) asks poor children to pay again.

The Gramm/Rudman plan is now in the hands of a House-Senate Conference Committee, composed of 48 Members of the House and 9 Senators. If this dangerous plan is allowed to pass without exempting the poor, children and families will suffer greatly. This comes at a time when one out of every five children in America is poor, and when increased suffering and deprivation are evident from all indicators, including: incidence of hunger and homelessness; reports of abuse and neglect; access to basic health care, child care, and educational services, and rates of teenage unemployment.

House conferees must exempt all programs serving poor children and families—entitlements and discretionary—from any additional budget cuts, and target its efforts to the real causes of Federal deficits—defense spending and tax expenditures.

GRAMM/RUDMAN WILL SERIOUSLY HURT POOR CHILDREN

Because Social Security and a large portion of the defense budget would be exempt from spending reductions, programs for poor children and families would be subject to cuts equal to as much as twice their share of total federal outlays. Gramm/Rudman would require automatic spending reductions for all expenditures deemed "controllable," notwithstanding the fact that many programs for poor children and families yield long-term savings which far exceed their cost.

The magnitude of automatic spending reductions under Gramm/Rudman will depend a great deal upon economic conditions in the years ahead. If the economy stalls and enters a recession, the budget cuts required to meet annual deficit targets will be severe. The following list illustrates how poor children and families would be hurt by spending reductions of 10 and 20 percent (levels which could be achieved as early as 1987 under the Senate's balanced budget proposal):

Medicaid.—A 10 percent cut would threaten services to 1 million children, while a 20 percent reduction would jeopardize Medicaid services to 2 million children. (In Texas, a study found that each dollar spent on preventive health care for children under Medicaid saved \$8 in long-term care costs and future lost income as children grew old enough to work.)

Head Start.—A 10 percent cut would deprive 45,000 children of a Head Start, while a 20 percent reduction would force 90,000 children out of the program. (A 20-year study of a preschool program like Head Start recently concluded that the total economic benefits of such a program are seven times greater than their cost.)

Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.—A 10 percent cut would result in a loss of compensatory education services to 500,000 children, while a 20 percent reduction would deny remedial assistance to 1 million children. (National evaluations of Title I revealed that participating students gained 10-17 percent more in reading and 9-74 percent more in mathematics than their non-Title I peers.)

Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Food Program (WIC).—A 10 percent cut in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) would eliminate services to 300,000 women and children, while a 20 percent reduction would deny this nutritional assistance to 600,000 women and children. (A Harvard study of WIC found that the reduced incidence of a low birth-weight babies needing extended hospital care saved \$3 in hospital costs for every \$1 spent in the prenatal component of WIC.)

Job Corps.—A 10 percent cut would force 10,000 disadvantaged teenagers out of Job Corps, while a 20 percent reduction would eliminate youth employment and training opportunities for 20,000 participants. (Cost-benefit analyses show that Job Corps yields \$1.45 in societal benefits for every dollar invested in the program.)

POOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES HAVE ALREADY UNFAIRLY SACRIFICED TOO MUCH

In 1981, programs for the poor were singled out for enormous budget sacrifice. More than \$10 billion a year has been cut from federal programs serving poor children and families. Virtually every federal program targeted to the poor and vulnerable has been seriously affected: child nutrition food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid and other health programs, education and job training, child care, child welfare programs, low-income housing, legal services and many others.

Federal outlays for programs for poor children and families have been slashed even as defense spending has soared. Between 1981 and 1984, real per capita expenditures for programs serving low-income families and children declined by 8 percent while real per capita defense outlays increased by 25 percent. Gramm/Rudman would make this imbalance far worse by permitting projections of further real growth in defense spending and then exempting roughly 40 percent of the defense budget from spending cuts before any automatic, "across-the-board" deficit reductions are made.

As a result of the deep sacrifices imposed by previous budget cuts, programs for poor children and families now fall far short of meeting basic human needs. Examples of our inadequate investments on behalf of low-income families include:

Health services under Medicaid reached 98 percent of all poor children in 1978; only 71 percent of all poor children were Medicaid recipients in 1983.

Head start is now reaching only 18 percent of all eligible children. Although 442,100 children are served, another 2 million are left out of the Head Start program.

AFDC benefits provided assistance to 76 percent of all poor children in 1978; only 53

percent of all poor children were reached by the AFDC program in 1983.

Nearly 800,000 fewer children participated in federal compensatory education programs (Chapter 1, formerly Title I) in the 1982 school year than were served in the 1979 school year.

The four basic child nutrition programs—the School Lunch, School Breakfast, Child Care Food, and Summer Food programs—suffered budget cuts of nearly 30 percent between fiscal year 1982 and 1985. As a result, 1.6 million poor children have been dropped from these child nutrition programs.

In 1977, half of all black and white high school graduates enrolled in college; by 1982, college enrollment among black high school graduates fell to 36 percent. Much of this decline can be traced to poverty—only one in every six poor black high school graduates attends college, as compared to one in three high school graduates from black and white families with incomes above the poverty line.

GRAMM/RUDMAN DOES NOT ADDRESS THE CAUSES OF RECENT FEDERAL DEFICITS

The unprecedented federal deficits incurred during the Reagan administration cannot be traced to programs for poor children and families. At the same time the low-income programs have been cut by \$10 billion annually, the deficit has increased from \$58 billion in fiscal year 1981 to nearly \$200 billion in each of the past three fiscal years.

Much of the current deficit stems directly from the combination of large tax reductions and rapid increases in defense spending which the Reagan administration has persistently advocated and successfully achieved. While federal tax revenues have dwindled to 18-19 percent of the Gross National Product, burgeoning defense expenditures have pushed federal outlays to about 24 percent of GNP. The administration added \$178 billion to the defense budget during its first term, and yet also won large tax reductions for wealthy Americans which effectively left the federal government without the means to support its defense build-up.

Between fiscal years 1984 and 1989, tax expenditures will increase by an estimated \$192 billion. If the Reagan administration's budget priorities are accepted, defense expenditures during the same period will increase by nearly \$350 billion. Yet Gramm/Rudman exempts all tax expenditures and approximately one-third on the defense budget from automatic spending reductions designed to achieve a balanced budget. The additional exemption of Social Security from required spending cut further ensures that programs for poor children and families will bear the brunt of deficit reductions under Gramm-Rudman.

Any serious and equitable balanced budget proposal must target budget cuts on the causes of the current federal deficits. All of the defense budget must be part of the base used to compute any budget reductions, and revenue measures and tax expenditures should also be considered as sources for deficit reductions.

Fairness and economic justice require that programs serving low-income children and families be fully exempt from Gramm/Rudman or any alternative balanced budget proposal. The poor have sacrificed more than their fair share in previous deficit reduction efforts. They must not be scapegoats once again.

POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN HAS RISEN DRAMATICALLY SINCE 1979

More than one of every five children in America today is poor. Half of all black children and nearly 40 percent of all Hispanic children are poor. A total of 12.9 million American children lived in poverty in 1984, an increase of 29 percent over 1979 level.

Children are not the poorest group in American society. Between 1959 and 1969, the poverty rate for children was cut nearly in half, from 26.9 percent to 13.8 percent. However, this trend was sharply reversed in recent years, and 21 percent of all children were poor in 1984. Over 3 million children fell into poverty between 1979 and 1983. In contrast, poverty among the nation's elderly has declined to the point that persons over age 65 in 1984 were less likely than the population as a whole to live in poverty.

The increased suffering and deprivation associated with child poverty is evident from all indicators.

The national death rate for infants between one month and one year of age increased by 6 percent between 1983 and 1984. By 1990, 22,000 American babies will die primarily because of low birthweight.

Over 66,000 children are now living without adequate shelter. An estimated 22 percent of the homeless living in shelters, not including runaway shelters, are children under age 18.

An estimated 1.5 million American children were reported abused or neglected in 1983, an increase of 200,000 over the previous year.

Families with young children and those headed by women are particularly vulnerable to poverty. One-fourth of all children below age 6, including one-half of all black children in this age group, are poor. More than half of all children in female-headed families are poor, and over two-thirds of black children in such families live in poverty. For families headed by women under age 25, the poverty rate exceeds 75 percent.

It is essential that House conferees insist that all programs serving the poor—both entitlement and discretionary—be fully exempt from Gramm-Rudman.

[Center on Budget and Policy Priorities]

BUDGET PROPOSALS MAKE LARGE REDUCTIONS IN LOW INCOME AND HUMAN RESOURCE PROGRAMS

Under the Administration's new budget proposals unveiled today, nearly all cuts would come from the domestic side of the budget. The reductions in human resource programs other than Social Security (education, health, social services, employment, income maintenance, retirement and disability programs) would be as large as all the cuts made in these programs in 1981 and 1982 combined.

In addition, low income programs, which were hit heavily during the Administration's first term, would be subject to large reductions once more (\$34 billion over the next three years) and would again receive a disproportionate share (19%) of the cuts. This marks the fifth consecutive Administration budget in which low income programs would be affected disproportionately (i.e., the percentage of the cuts coming from low income programs would be larger than the share which the programs comprise of the overall budget).

While overall federal spending (other than interest payments on the national debt) would remain frozen at \$804 billion, spending for defense and related areas would rise \$30 billion while domestic spend-

ing would be cut \$30 billion below FY 1985 levels. See Table 6. (The "real" cut in domestic spending, after inflation is taken into account, is considerably more than \$30 billion.)

Although the Administration is listing \$8.7 billion in defense cuts, the Department of Defense budget would actually grow 5.9% after inflation. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) considers any defense spending growth over 5% above inflation to be an increase that enlarges the deficit, not a cut that shrinks it.

If, therefore, the defense "savings" are not counted as deficit reductions, approximately 95% of the actual cuts in the budget come from the 40 percent of the budget (exclusive of interest payments) that consists of domestic programs other than Social Security. This is the same part of the budget that bore most of the cuts during the Administration's first term. (If the defense "savings" are counted as cuts, then over 80% of the cuts come in the 40% of the budget that is comprised of domestic programs other than Social Security.)

Reductions in human resources programs (except Social Security) would be equal in size to all such human resources cuts enacted in 1981 and 1982 combined, when the bulk of the earlier budget cuts were made. The new proposals call for cuts in human resources programs (other than Social Security) of \$65.6 billion during the first three years they would be in effect (fiscal years 1986 through 1988). Congressional Budget Office (CBO) analyses show that the cuts enacted from January 1981 through July 1983 in these programs totaled \$55.8 billion during the first three years those cuts were in effect (FY 1982 through FY 1984). When the earlier cuts are adjusted for inflation (to reflect prices in the FY 1986 to FY 1988 period), those cuts increase to \$65.9 billion. This means that after adjusting for inflation, the new human resources cuts would be almost exactly the same as the cuts enacted earlier. If the new proposals are approved, the total amount of human resources cuts in areas other than Social Security thus will double (Tables 1 and 2).

The reductions proposed in human resource programs are \$13.8 billion in FY 1986, \$23.1 billion in FY 1987, and \$28.7 billion in FY 1988.

Despite rhetoric concerning "freezes," many fewer domestic programs would be frozen at last year's levels than had earlier been thought. Large numbers of programs are actually reduced below FY 1985 levels.

Some programs would be cut in both FY 1985 and FY 1986. The FY 1985 cuts would be achieved largely through proposals to "rescind" funds Congress has already appropriated for this year. Programs that would be cut both years include the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children;¹ the summer youth employment program; employment and training programs for dislocated workers; payments for the operation of low income housing projects; assistance to "magnet schools" (to aid in desegregation), and bi-lingual education.

¹ Congress has appropriated \$1.5 billion for WIC in FY 1985, but the Administration proposes to release to states only \$1.424 billion of this amount and to return the remainder to the Treasury. For FY 1986, the Administration is proposing \$1.48 billion for WIC. Funding for both years would be cut below the level Congress appropriated for FY 1985.

LOW INCOME PROGRAMS

Low income programs would again be hit hard. Cuts in programs that primarily serve low income persons would total \$4.0 billion in outlays over the next three years—or 19% of the total cuts (assuming the defense "savings" are not considered to be cuts; if the defense savings are counted, then 16% of the total cuts would come in the low income area). See Table 3.

The low income reductions total \$7.1 billion in FY 1986, \$11.8 billion in FY 1987, and \$15.1 billion in FY 1988.

While cost-of-living adjustments would be provided in Supplemental Security Income, food stamps, and veterans pensions, nearly all other low income programs would either be frozen, cut below last year's levels, or terminated.

Moreover, this substantially understates the full magnitude of the cuts on low income families:

The universe of low income programs used here does not include a number of programs which are not means-tested or directed principally to low income persons, but in which a disproportionate share of the benefits still go to low income persons. For example, urban mass transit aid would be terminated, while Older Americans Act services for the elderly would be frozen.

The \$34 billion in low income program reductions also do not include proposed reductions in Medicare. The new Administration proposals would substantially increase the premiums that Medicare beneficiaries pay (those premiums would double by 1989). This would affect low income persons two ways: first, low income elderly persons not on Medicaid would have to pay the increased premium out of their own pockets. Second, state governments would have to pay the increased premium for low income Medicare beneficiaries who are on Medicaid, and the resulting increase in state Medicaid costs would likely lead many states to reduce Medicaid eligibility and benefits further to offset the new expenses.

Finally, the \$34 billion in savings substantially understates the dimensions of the proposed cuts in HUD subsidized housing. The budget shows a reduction in actual spending (or "outlays") of \$1.3 billion for HUD subsidized housing next year. But the budget also calls for an appropriations cut of \$9.6 billion in HUD subsidized housing next year—a reduction over seven times as large. The full \$9.6 billion would indeed be cut, but (due to fiscal and accounting procedures used in this program), the bulk of these cuts will not show up on the books as "outlay" reductions until after FY 1986.

As a result, the reductions in HUD subsidized housing would increase steadily in future years—and the overall reductions proposed in low income programs would grow larger and larger in future years.

Proposed cuts in a number of low income areas would have substantial impacts.

The Medicaid program, which provides health care coverage for poor families with children and poor elderly and disabled persons, would be cut \$6.5 billion over the next three years (\$1.1 billion in FY 1986). These cuts would double the Medicaid cuts made during the first three Reagan years. The earlier cuts resulted in reductions in Medicaid coverage in nearly every state in the country. Most states either eliminated some persons from Medicaid (the Urban Institute found a marked decline in the number of low income elderly and disabled persons covered), or ended coverage for specific medical

services (such as eyeglasses for poor children, dental care, or prescription drugs). The new Medicaid proposals include further reductions of such a magnitude that they would be virtually certain to result in substantial additional cuts throughout the country in medical services to the poor.

The Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) would be provided insufficient funding to maintain its current caseload. Over 100,000 low income pregnant women, infants, and children at nutritional risk would be dropped from the program.

Subsidized housing would eventually be provided to 200,000 fewer low income families and elderly persons who qualify for it than if current policies were continued. This would intensify the housing crisis in low income communities. (According to some estimates, 500,000 low rent housing units are not lost to the housing stock each year due to condominium conversions, rent increases, decay, or abandonment. When the Reagan Administration took office, over 250,000 low rent units were being added back to the stock each year through federally-supported construction or rehabilitation efforts. Due to deep cuts in subsidized housing in the first years of the Administration, only 100,000 units a year are now being restored. The new proposals would cut subsidized housing still further, providing no funds for any low income units and effectively eliminating for two years the program which currently adds back 100,000 units per year.) In addition, federal funds for operations and maintenance of public housing projects would be reduced.

In the child nutrition area, the proposed termination of federal support for school meals served to children from families with incomes over 185 percent of the poverty line (now \$18,870 for a family of four) would be expected to lead to the discontinuance of the school lunch program at some thousands of schools. U.S. Department of Agriculture research shows that this proposal would lead several million children to stop buying school lunches. This, in turn, would render the program economically infeasible in a number of areas. When schools drop out of the program, poor children in attendance at those schools lose free school lunches.

In addition, federal reimbursements for free school lunches and breakfasts served to poor children would be frozen, while the cost of the food in the meals would rise. As a result, school districts with heavy concentrations of poor students would have to either reduce the amount or quality of the food, or find new sources of funding to meet these costs.

Major reductions would also be made in financial aid to needy students. Appropriations for this program would be reduced \$1.3 billion below the FY 1985 level, for a reduction of 27%.

A number of low income programs would be shut down completely, including Jobs Corps (evaluations have shown Job Corps to be one of the more cost effective of training programs for unemployed youth), the Work Incentive Program (which is designed to help welfare mothers find jobs and leave public assistance rolls), legal services, rural housing programs, and the community services block grant (which is the continuation of the old Office of Economic Opportunity).

Other low income programs that would be reduced below FY 1985 levels, even without adjusting for inflation, include: compensatory education for disadvantaged children, bi-

lingual education, the summer youth employment program, the community development block grant program, and the primary health care block grant.

When added to the budget cuts already enacted since 1981, the combined impacts in many of these programs would be very large, as the chart below shows (see Table 4 and 5 for more details):

COMBINED REDUCTIONS IN OUTLAYS FROM NEW CUTS AND CUTS ALREADY ENACTED

[Outlays represent actual Government spending each year; in percent]

	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1986-88 3- year total
Child nutrition	35.0	37.7
Medicaid	10.1	13.5
Housing assistance	20.8	23.4
Employment and training	68.8	69.3
Jobs Corps	29.0	76.4

COMBINED REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

[In percent]

	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1986-88 3- year total
Subsidized housing	98.5	92.6
Community services	100.0	100.0
Legal services	100.0	100.0
Employment and training	79.5	79.6
WIC	100.0	100.0
Jobs Corps	100.0	100.0
Compensatory education	14.5	18.9

CUTS IN OTHER AREAS

In addition to large cuts in human resource programs and programs targeted to the poor, other budget areas that would be subject to large reductions are farm and rural programs, cities, and federal employees.

Farm and rural programs that would be hit hard include farm price supports (\$16 billion in cuts over three years; \$2 billion in FY 1986); rural housing programs (\$8.8 billion over three years; \$2.2 billion in FY 1986); farm credit programs (\$10.1 billion in reductions over three years; \$3.0 billion next year); rural electrification programs (\$1.9 billion over three years; \$0.2 billion next year); and soil and water conservation.

Many of the principal programs relied on by cities would be terminated. Federal funding for urban mass transit would be ended (a \$4.2 billion cut over three years; \$0.8 billion next year). In addition, general revenue sharing would be terminated after FY 1986, Urban Development Action Grants would be terminated, and the Community Development Block Grant (which grew, in part, out of the old Model Cities program) would be cut 10% below a freeze level.

TABLE 1.—CBO ESTIMATES OF CHANGES IN HUMAN RESOURCE PROGRAMS—OTHER THAN SOCIAL SECURITY—FROM LEGISLATION ENACTED JANUARY 1981 TO JULY 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			3-yr total
	1982	1983	1984	
Retirement and disability:				
Civil service retirement.....	-440	-576	-683	-1,699
Veterans' pensions and compensation.....	-2	-159	-199	-360
SSI.....	+32	+73	+582	+687
Other income security:				
Unemployment insurance.....	-1,000	+3,000	-4,500	-2,500

TABLE 1.—CBO ESTIMATES OF CHANGES IN HUMAN RESOURCE PROGRAMS—OTHER THAN SOCIAL SECURITY—FROM LEGISLATION ENACTED JANUARY 1981 TO JULY 1983—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			3-yr
	1982	1983	1984	total
AFDC.....	-875	-1,222	-1,288	-3,385
Food Stamps.....	-1,535	-1,343	-2,031	-4,904
Child Nutrition.....	-1,026	-1,305	-1,392	-3,723
WIC.....	-48	+113	+77	+142
Housing assistance.....		+107	-452	-345
Low income energy assistance.....	-127	-160	-194	-481
Health:				
Medicare.....	-550	-2,900	-4,150	-7,600
Medicaid.....	-866	-1,026	-1,336	-3,228
Other health services.....	-77	-238	-467	-782
Education and social services:				
Compensatory education.....	-370	-701	-799	-1,870
Head Start.....	+14	-5	-10	-1
Vocational Education.....	-102	-172	-161	-435
GSL's.....	-275	-787	-1,170	-2,232
Student financial assistance.....	-320	-430	-664	-1,414
Community services block grant.....	-216	-247	-261	-724
Social services block grant.....	-699	-642	-699	-2,040
Veterans' readjustment benefits.....	-225	-175	-150	-550
Employment and training:				
General employment & training.....	-1,260	-1,956	-2,011	-5,227
Job Corps.....	-13	-21	-51	-85
Public service employment.....	-3,760	-4,142	-4,458	-12,360
Work Incentive Program.....	-100	-142	-153	-395
Total.....	13,840	15,056	26,620	55,516

¹ In the OMB documents in the new budget proposals, the Legal Services Corporation is grouped with the community services block grant. If cuts from fiscal year 1982 through fiscal year 1984 in legal services are added, the reductions shown here grow by \$300,000,000 over the 3-yr period, bringing the total reductions to \$55,800,000,000.

Source: Congressional Budget Office, "Major Legislative Changes in Human Resources Programs Since January 1981," August 1983.

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAMS ¹

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			3-year totals
	1986	1987	1988	
Medicaid.....	1.1	2.1	3.3	6.5
AFDC.....	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6
Food Stamps.....	(^a)	.1	.1	.2
Child nutrition.....	.6	.9	1.0	2.5
Employment and training.....	.1	.7	1.0	1.8
Financial aid for needy students.....	.3	1.1	1.3	2.7
Compensatory and Handicapped education.....	(^a)	.3	.4	.7
Other elementary education.....	(^a)	(^a)	.1	.1
Other higher education.....	.1	.2	.2	.5
WIC and other nutrition.....	.1	.1	.1	.3
Low Income Energy Assistance.....	.1	.1	.1	.3
Health block grants and other health community services block grant & Legal Services Corporation/Social Services ^a9	1.2	1.3	3.4
Subsidized housing ^a	3.8	5.1	5.9	14.8
Railroad retirement/black lung.....		.1	.1	.2
Federal civilian retirement.....	.8	1.4	2.0	4.2
Other retirement disability.....	.1	.2	.2	.5
Vocational education.....	(^a)	(^a)	.1	.1
Libraries/education research.....	.1	.1	.1	.3
Impact aid.....	.1	.2	.2	.5
Health professions education.....	.1	.2	.3	.6
Veterans health care.....	.3	1.0	1.0	2.3
Health research (NIH).....	.2	.5	.5	1.2
Guaranteed student loans.....	.4	.4	.4	1.2
Medicare.....	4.1	6.3	8.2	18.6
Total.....	13.8	23.1	28.7	65.6

¹ Human resources programs are defined in a similar manner to the definition utilized by the Congressional Budget Office in its August 1983 study, "Major Legislative Changes in Human Resources Programs Since January 1981." Human resources programs include retirement and disability programs, other income security programs, health care programs, education and social services, and employment programs.

^a Less than \$50 million

^b Includes community services block grant, work incentive program, legal services, social services block grant, human development and family and rehabilitation services.

^c Includes public housing operating subsidies, rural housing and Indian housing.

TABLE 3.—PROPOSED CUTS IN PROGRAMS THAT ARE MEANS-TESTED OR THAT PRIMARILY SERVICE LOW-INCOME PERSONS

(Dollar amounts in billions)

Fiscal year—	1986	1987	1988	3-year totals
Medicaid	\$1.1	\$2.1	\$3.3	\$6.5
AFDC	2	2	2	6
Food stamps	(2)	1	1	2
Child nutrition ¹	(2)	2	2	4
Employment & training	1	7	1.0	1.8
Financial aid for needy students	3	1.1	1.3	2.7
Compensatory education	(2)	2	3	5
Bilingual/Indian education	(2)	(2)	1	1
WIC	1	1	1	3
Low income energy assistance	1	1	1	3
Low income weatherization	.05	1	2	4
Health block grants and other health services	3	3	4	10
Social Services and related ²	9	1.2	1.3	3.4
Subsidized housing ³	3.8	5.1	5.9	14.8
Rural water/sewer facilities ⁴	1	2	3	6
Community development block grants ⁵	(2)	1	3	4
Total	7.1	11.8	15.1	34.0

These cuts as percent of total cuts proposed⁶ (not counting defense savings as cuts)

	18.2	18.5	19.3	18.8
--	------	------	------	------

These cuts as percent of total cuts proposed (including defense savings)

	14.9	16.2	17.1	16.3
--	------	------	------	------

¹ Savings from the freeze on Federal reimbursements on free and reduced price meals served to low income children.

² Less than \$50 million; column totals include these small reductions.

³ Includes community services block grant, work incentive program, legal services, social services block grant, human development and family and rehabilitation services.

⁴ Includes public housing operating subsidies, Indian housing, and rural housing. Rural housing programs are primarily directed to low income rural residents and to farmworkers. The budget proposal would terminate the rural programs and merge them with the HUD subsidized housing program.

⁵ The majority of Federal funds for rural water and sewer facilities are targeted to low and moderate income communities.

⁶ By law, no less than 51 percent of CDBG funds must be directed to low and moderate income communities.

⁷ Total cuts proposed exclude debt service savings.

TABLE 4.—THE COMBINED EFFECT IN SELECTED LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS OF THE NEW BUDGET PROPOSALS AND CUTS PREVIOUSLY ENACTED SINCE 1981

(In millions of dollars)

Program	1986	1987	1988	3-yr total
Child nutrition:				
Spending without cuts	5,337	5,775	6,225	17,337
Actual spending	3,467	3,545	3,789	10,801
Percent reduction	35.0	38.6	39.1	37.7
Medicaid:				
Spending without cuts	26,351	28,660	31,330	86,341
Actual spending	23,691	24,772	26,187	74,650
Percent reduction	10.1	13.6	16.4	13.5
Housing assistance:				
Spending without cuts	13,227	13,791	14,440	41,458
Actual spending	10,481	10,538	10,733	31,752
Percent reduction	20.8	23.6	25.7	23.4
Employment and training:				
Spending without cuts	9,768	9,972	10,266	30,006
Actual spending	3,044	3,047	3,122	9,213
Percent reduction	68.8	69.4	69.6	69.3
Job Corps:				
Spending without cuts	762	749	779	2,289
Actual spending	541	0	0	541
Percent reduction	29.0	100.0	100.0	76.4
WIC:				
Spending without cuts	482	497	513	1,491
Actual spending	60	0	0	60
Percent reduction	87.5	100.0	100.0	96.0

Note: "Spending without cuts since 1981" is the 1981 outlay level (prior to the recessions proposed by President Reagan and enacted by Congress) after adjusting for inflation and changes in economic conditions as computed by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) in "Major Legislative Changes in Human Resources Programs Since January 1981" (August 1983). The CBO report includes estimates through fiscal year 1985. Because the CBO used inflation projections for fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984 that were higher than the actual level of inflation, the CBO outlay levels have been reduced here by the difference between actual and projected inflation levels. The adjusted CBO outlay levels were then increased for fiscal years 1986 through 1988 by applying the percentage increase that the Office of Management and Budget has used in its fiscal year 1986 budget documents for spending levels for each program.

"New proposals" is taken directly from the administration's new budget proposals.

"Percent reduction" is the combined percentage that spending would be reduced below the 1981 level as a result of both the administration's proposals

and cuts already enacted, after adjusting for inflation and changes in economic conditions.

TABLE 5.—THE COMBINED EFFECT IN SELECTED LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS OF THE NEW BUDGET PROPOSALS AND CUTS PREVIOUSLY ENACTED SINCE 1981

(In millions of dollars)

Program	1986	1987	1988	3-year total
Housing assistance:				
Appropriation without cuts	32,619	33,989	35,348	101,955
Actual appropriation	499	1,904	5,181	7,584
Percent reduction	98.5	94.4	85.3	92.6
Compensatory education (title I):				
Appropriation without cuts	4,430	4,616	4,800	13,845
Actual appropriation	3,787	3,698	3,738	11,223
Percent reduction	14.5	19.9	22.1	18.9
Community services block grant:				
Appropriation without cuts	677	706	734	2,117
Actual appropriation	0	0	0	0
Percent reduction	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Training and employment:				
Appropriation without cuts	13,701	14,276	14,847	42,825
Actual appropriation	2,806	2,906	2,906	8,618
Percent reduction	79.5	79.6	80.4	79.9
WIC:				
Appropriation without cuts	456	475	494	1,426
Actual appropriation	0	0	0	0
Percent reduction	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Legal services:				
Appropriation without cuts	401	418	435	1,254
Actual appropriation	0	0	0	0
Percent reduction	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Housing assistance includes low-income housing operating subsidies. The fiscal year 1988 appropriation for housing assistance is the fiscal year 1986 level increased for inflation. The fiscal year 1986 level, of \$23,200,000, represents the amount of new budget authority that Congress appropriated.

Note: "Appropriations without cuts since 1981" represents the level of funding that Congress appropriated in 1981 (before recessions were implemented by President Reagan) as adjusted for inflation for succeeding years. The inflation adjustments were made by first increasing the 1981 appropriations by the actual CPI-U through the end of fiscal year 1984. This 1984 inflation-adjusted appropriations level was then increased by the inflation projections for fiscal years 1985 through 1988 assumed in the Office of Management and Budget's new budget documents.

"New proposals" is taken from the administration's fiscal year 1986 budget proposals. It represents the administration requested appropriations for these selected programs.

"Percent reduction" is the combined percentage that appropriations would be reduced below the 1981 level as a result of both the administration's new proposals and the cuts already enacted.

Table 6.—Outlays for Defense and Domestic Spending Under Administration Budget

(In billions of dollars)

I. Outlays for defense and related ("national interest") programs:	
Fiscal year 1985	283.1
Fiscal year 1986	313.2
Change (increase)	30.1
II. Non-defense outlays other than interest payments:	
Fiscal year 1985	521.3
Fiscal year 1986	490.9
Change (decrease)	30.4

Mr. FRANK. I will be submitting further material later.

Virtually every organization in this country which deals with the needs of the poor, the physically handicapped, the vulnerable elderly, speaks out against the Gramm-Rudman proposal.

Again we are not talking here—the gentleman from New York is to be congratulated for putting this into perspective—we are not talking about equality. Gramm-Rudman says much of the Defense Department is exempt, I do not think people understand that, because we have signed contracts. And if we have signed a contract with a contractor to charge us a couple hundred dollars for an ashtray, that is sacrosanct. But if, on the other hand, we want to provide funds for pregnant women in distressed circumstances so

they will have healthy children, well that is a discretionary program and it has got to be cut.

I have not made that up. That is Gramm-Rudman. That is the extraordinarily distorted piece of legislation that has come over to us. That is what many of us are so appalled by. That is what has led the Catholic Conference, the Lutheran Bishops, the Jewish organizations, all the organizations concerned with the poor, the Child Welfare League and others, all of them express their opposition.

Let me just read a few more: The American Association of Retired Persons, the National Council of Senior Citizens, National Political Caucus of Black Women, the United Church of Christ, the Food and Commercial Workers Union, the American Association of University Women, the American Physical Therapy Association—that is a radical group for you—the Association of Retarded Citizens, the National PTA—another subversive organization. It just goes on and on, not because these are people who are interested in balancing the budget, but because they do not understand why you triple Star Wars.

Do you know what President Reagan said a little while ago? He said that under his administration in his 5 years, he said it on the radio, agricultural subsidies are 3½ times higher than they were in the previous 5 years, agricultural subsidies, some of which go to very needy farmers, but some of which go to quite wealthy people. They get 3½ times as much in the past 5 years as they got in the previous 5 years, while poor people, needy people have been cut back substantially.

That is Gramm-Rudman's priority list and that is appalling and it is why we have to drastically change that piece of legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reply to the statement made before about President Reagan's expenditures.

One of the things that the authors, the sponsors of Gramm-Rudman would like for us to forget as they orchestrate their stampede toward approval of the Gramm-Rudman proposal is the fact that we have a serious problem in the Pentagon which has gotten the greatest proportion of the expenditures under the Reagan administration. There is the problem of large sums of money, billions and billions, megabucks, being thrown at military problems and the result has been a failure, the failure of being certified by the gentleman in the other body who have the greatest knowledge and oversight responsibilities for the military. They are saying that our dollars have not brought us a better defense.

Of course, there are numerous examples, some of which I will share

with you in a moment, of that tremendous waste which took place in the Pentagon.

But first, I would like to recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said, both correctly and incorrectly, about the unconstitutionality of the Gramm-Rudman proposal. Granted, the Gramm-Rudman is a flagrant violation of the principle of balance of power among the three branches of Government, and gives the executive far more authority than was ever intended by our forefathers. I am curious as to why so many of my colleagues are willing to relinquish such a substantial portion of their rightful jurisdiction—spelled out clearly in the Articles of the Constitution—to the President. But putting constitutional matters aside for a moment, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the impact the Gramm-Rudman proposal would have on the Nation's lower income people.

Since its first inauguration in 1980, the administration has exhibited a blatant hostility to the lower echelons of our society. Beginning in 1981, more than \$10 billion a year has been cut from programs serving the poor. Virtually every Federal program targeted to the poor and vulnerable has been subject to deep and harsh budget cuts. Cuts have been made to such programs as: Child Nutrition, Food Stamps, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, Education and Job Training Programs, Child Care and Child Welfare Programs, Housing Programs, Legal Services, the list goes on. The results of these cuts have been disastrous. Poverty rates have shot up dramatically. It is estimated that more than one of every five children in America lives below the poverty line—that half of all black children, and almost 40 percent of all Hispanic children are poor. What does the future hold for these children if the administration's present budget priorities remain the same? In all likelihood, many of them will come to know the increased hunger and homelessness that now plague a rising ebb of adults. They will learn the meaning of a high rate of unemployment, and the lack of services which are designed to equip youth with valuable job skills. They will learn the frustration that too many of our able-bodied citizens experience when they discover that there are simply no jobs for them; and an alienation from our society which I believe to be the ultimate tragedy.

Given the present administration's time-proven lack of compassion for those who are struggling to survive, I ask my colleagues, is it wise to give the President even more power to cut these programs? The Gramm-Rudman

proposal will undoubtedly shift new control to the President by virtue of the automatic spending reduction power provided to the executive in the plan. Under Gramm-Rudman the President can force automatic spending reductions by vetoing the deficit reduction package which Congress sends to him. This gives the President tremendous leverage over the deficit reduction decisionmaking process. The President can force Congress to pass a budget package which he favors in order to avoid the automatic spending reductions. And you know what kind of budget the President favors: One with substantial increases for Defense, and with deep cuts in social programs. Under Gramm-Rudman, the President is given total discretion as to whether or not automatic spending reductions should be made if the deficit projection exceeds the target by less than 5 percent.

Furthermore, the President will also be given total discretion in instituting automatic spending reductions in times of recession. Are the Members of Congress willing to place such a blind trust in the President? What shall we tell our constituents when they demand to know why the programs they have always supported have been sacrificed to the already bloated defense budget? What shall we tell the history students when they question our wisdom of permanently altering the balance of power simply because Members of the 99th Congress opted for giving the President full discretion in balancing the budget, rather than performing our Constitution-appointed duty of preparing the Nation's budget? Last, and most tragically, what do we tell the Nation's children who already go to bed hungry, and whose parents wait patiently on soup lines for an insufficient amount of food to feed their family? Do we know that their future is safe and secure under the present administration?

There is no doubt in my mind that giving the President a free hand in automatic spending reductions will result in thousands of poor children being denied participation in the Head Start Program, and thousands more from the highly successful Chapter I Program for the educationally disadvantaged. Food stamps would be cut below the Federal Government's minimum dietary plan, and school breakfast and lunch programs would be cut. Large numbers of women and children would be thrown off the WIC Program, and the health care, housing and basic survival needs of the poor would be further jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, let me close in saying that in 32 years, the Congress has never spent as much as the President requested, and I urge my colleagues not to abandon those who are relying on fiscal responsibility for their future. Let us not further bloat the de-

fense budget at the expense of our moral obligations. And, most importantly, let us not destroy the integrity of the principles laid out in the Constitution by passing the Gramm-Rudman proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your time.

□ 1750

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues today to participate in this Special Order on the effect that the Gramm-Rudman budget proposal will have on poor and disadvantaged citizens in this country. My opposition to Gramm-Rudman comes from a deep sense of responsibility to my constituents, as well as a deep sense of fear as to what Gramm-Rudman means to them. Proponents of this amendment say that we have a deficit and that we must somehow reduce that deficit. I do not disagree with that basic premise, but I do disagree with the way that this amendment proposes to balance the budget.

My congressional district is the poorest in the State of Illinois. As we are all aware, programs that serve the poor have been cut ruthlessly since 1981. More than \$10 billion a year has been cut from virtually every Federal program serving poor families and children; including child nutrition programs, food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid and health programs, housing programs, legal services and many others. The results have been nothing short of disastrous. Twenty percent of all the children in our Nation now grow up poor. That includes 40 percent of all Hispanic children and half of all black children in our Nation. However, Gramm-Rudman sends a message that says it does not matter how much has already been cut, all that matters is the deficit. Gramm-Rudman says that it doesn't matter how hungry or how poor you are or if you are homeless or unemployed. The only thing that matters is reducing the deficit and nothing, not even elected Members of the U.S. Congress, can stop the President from continuing to cut programs that serve the poor.

I am also concerned about the constitutionality of this amendment. It seems to me that if we accept the Gramm-Rudman proposal, we have become mere "puppets" of the President—waiting to react to his every whim. Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I will not be a "mechanism" for the President. Not for this President, nor any other, regardless of political affiliation. It is true that President Reagan was reelected with a huge majority of those who voted in the election in No-

vember 1984. But Mr. Speaker, so was I.

In November of 1984, I received 95 percent of the vote in my district, a higher percentage than even the President.

My constituents elected me to be their Member of Congress and to speak out on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, whenever I go home to Chicago, people always seek my assistance. They tell me of their problems, of their hunger, of the sad state of our schools, of the pain of their joblessness. And they ask me, as their Member of Congress, to help them, to assist them, to prod the Federal Government to do something on their behalf. They show me their heating bills and their rent bills, and they ask me, Congressman, what can you do to help us? Well, I tell them, I am only one Congressman, but you can count on me to vote and struggle in your behalf. Gramm-Rudman, however, limits my ability to work on behalf of my constituents. It gives congressional power to the President. It represents a fundamental restructuring of congressional power and transfers it to the President of the United States. In short, it is an abdication of our congressional responsibility. What does Gramm-Rudman say to my constituents? It says, forget your Member of Congress—no matter what he or she may believe. The mechanism is more important than what the Congress or the people of the district believe.

Gramm-Rudman is a dangerous and ill-conceived notion on how to deal with our Nation's deficit. It barely deals with military spending at all, and leaves social programs to be attacked and brutally assaulted once again. Even so, there is not enough left in social programs to solve our budgetary problems. What we should be about is making life better for our fellow citizens, not sowing the seeds of their demise. Gramm-Rudman offers just the latter. Not only does it allow wholesale budget reductions for non-defense programs, it also holds open the possibility that the President, under the guise of protecting our national security, could exempt defense spending from across-the-board cuts. Until we are willing to deal with reducing the amount that we spend on the military and with increasing revenue to the Federal Government, balancing the budget will only be a futile and painful exercise.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support what is left of programs serving the neediest of our society and to reject Gramm-Rudman for the shallow and irresponsible abdication of congressional authority that it is.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I would like to say that we represent very similar districts. Of the 10 poorest congressional districts in America,

I think the district represented by the gentleman from Illinois ranks third among the poor districts. My districts ranks 10th among the 10 poorest districts.

In New York City we have four. In rich New York City we have 4 of the 10 poorest congressional districts in America. These are districts that have problems that are not fashionable to discuss nowadays. Nobody wants to talk about that agenda. We have a policy that is not stated in this country of triage, of throwing overboard certain segments of the population, of throwing overboard certain neighborhoods, certain congressional districts. Nothing is going to be done about the high unemployment in these 10 districts, unemployment which runs for adults around 20 percent, for teenagers close to 50 percent. We are going to ignore that because we have a deficit problem to address and we are going to address that deficit problem by creating new policies and new budget actions which can only deepen the misery and deepen the problems in these districts.

Yesterday we had a hearing in Yonkers, NY, on teenage suicide. The hearing was held in Yonkers in Westchester because that is a suburban community, an affluent community, and that is where most of the suicides, it is alleged, most of the suicides have been taking place. It just so happened in the course of that hearing one of the people testifying brought to the panel the fact that in 1983 in New York City more than 80 teenagers committed suicide in that year, in 1983. There were no headlines. There was no great deal of media attention paid to it, but evidently among the poor, among those who are oppressed in various ways, suicide is as much a way of escape as among the affluent.

People can despair for many reasons and certainly the despair of poverty, the despair that has overtaken our communities in these 10 poor congressional districts is a despair which has led to teenage suicides.

In the 1960's and even in the early eighties the cry used to be heard, "I'm fired up. I can't take no more." In some demonstrations where teen-agers marched, this was a favorite chant. Evidently, it is no longer a chant. They have lost so much hope that instead of being fired up, not being able to take any more, and therefore taking action through peaceful demonstrations, they are taking the way out of suicide as an escape valve.

We cannot have a situation escalating of this kind where despair, the problem of education, and certainly the despair of finding a job, the fact that these same teenagers are watching their unemployed older brothers and sisters, they are watching their unemployed elders, their fathers and mothers, their aunts and uncles, and

they do not feel that getting a high-school degree or even getting a college degree is going to solve the problem of unemployment. They see too many high-school graduates who are unemployed and too many college graduates who are having difficulty finding jobs.

These problems we do not want to discuss anymore. We cannot deal with them because they involve spending money for job training. They involve spending more money for upgrading our educational systems and we say that we do not have the money, so let us not discuss them. Let us take the hiatus and leave it in a state of vacuum so that 10 years from now we will wake up and find ourselves suffering from tremendous problems as a result of the fact that we refused to face these problems.

The only concern, we say, is the deficit and the only way to solve the deficit is to cut back on these same programs that are so needed by groups like the people who reside in the 10 poorest congressional districts.

We do not want to remember, we do not want to discuss the fact that we have discovered that the Pentagon pays \$9,609 for a 12-cent wrench.

We do not want to discuss that an antenna motor assembly alignment pin which costs 2 cents, the Pentagon was paying \$7,417 for it.

We do not want to discuss the fact that a claw hammer which costs \$17 in a hardware store, the Pentagon was paying \$436 for it. We want to forget all this. It has had its headlines and we want to forget that. It has nothing to do with deficit reduction.

We do not want to discuss the fact that a flat washer which costs \$3 in a hardware store, the Pentagon was paying \$387 for that same flat washer.

We do not want to remember that a plastic stool cap costing 22 cents, the Pentagon was paying \$1,118 for that same plastic stool cap.

We do not want to remember that a screw which costs 9 cents, cost the Pentagon \$37.

A jeweler's screwdriver, \$1.79, was costing \$232.

A Phillips screwdriver, \$1.69, was costing \$258.06.

This is all considered irrelevant. It has nothing to do with reduction of the deficit.

We have phenomenon where dollars are thrown at military problems and we are failing, corruption has set in, abuses have set in. Instead of addressing ourselves more vigorously to these problems, we would like to focus on giving the President the power to make the cuts where he wants to make them. The President already has the power to deal with abuses in defense contracting. He already has the power to deal with waste.

Most of these abuses, most of this waste was discovered by Members of

Congress, a wrench that cost \$8, \$2,228 being paid.

An end box wrench that cost \$4.99, \$768 was being paid by the Pentagon.

A socket set wrench, \$12.88, cost \$545.

This is all quite relevant to the problems we are facing now. We have a budget that has been in deficit, that has been greatly escalated by this administration and this administration's one area of increased expenditures which stands out is expenditures for defense.

□ 1805

So why can we not discuss and why do not the gentlemen who are in conference now with the other body, the gentlemen from this House, why do they have to dwell within the framework of Gramm-Rudman alone. Gramm-Rudman sets a certain framework. Gramm-Rudman sets a psychological atmosphere and wants to stamper us into dealing with that framework and that framework alone, and I say we should be talking about ways to cut the budget in intelligent ways.

We should follow the example of the Congressional Black Caucus, which focused on the one area where we have the most money. The most money appropriated is appropriated in the area of defense. The greatest waste is there. The greatest set of mistakes in policymaking is occurring there. This is not my assessment of the situation. This is the assessment of the gentlemen who are given the responsibility for overseeing our military and defense apparatus.

The gentleman from the Senate who oversees these matters have declared that we are grossly mismanaging our defense resources. If we are grossly mismanaging our defense resources, then instead of discussing Gramm-Rudman at great length in conference, why do we not discuss how to better manage our defense resources and make cuts and get a greater value for our dollar in that area? Why do we not discuss the tax breaks that were given in 1981? Why do we not begin by discussing the fact that we have created a situation where many of the Fortune 500 corporations pay zero taxes, zero taxes. This is a scandal. We discussed it for a little bit. It was on the front pages of the newspapers. The media talked about it a little. Now we are pushing all that to the background.

It is still relevant. It is relevant to discuss why certain corporations in this country paid no taxes; why certain other corporations got huge refunds. It is relevant to discuss the fact that our tax breaks, for example, related to accelerated depreciation cost us \$27.7 billion. It is relevant to discuss that our expenses for oil and gas cost \$2.25 billion. Investment tax credits cost \$31.94 billion. Municipal bonds and various other local debt issues,

capital gains, \$2.64 billion. Various tax expenditures ought to be discussed at this point, and how we can deal with closing those loopholes. Why do we have to have a Gramm-Rudman framework which does not talk about a trigger mechanism for anything except more cuts?

We do not reach certain decisions. We do not have a budget imbalance. The President has the power to begin to make certain cuts. Why not give the power to the President to implement certain taxes, not income taxes necessarily, but we could close loopholes, we could make every corporation pay a minimum tax. A minimum tax on corporations would yield no less than \$25 billion, and probably much more than that.

Our failure to discuss these matters at this time means that we will continue dumping on those that we have been dumping on all along. We will continue our triage policies. More and more people are going to be dumped overboard.

The employment policies of this country right now are designed to take care of the majority. As long as only 10 percent of the people are out of work, nobody is worried about it. President Reagan at one point said, "If 9 out of 10 people are working, then what are you worried about?" One-tenth of those people who are not working are still important, and if we ignore them, there is an escalation and we may have that same unemployment doubling, tripling, et cetera. Even that one-tenth, if it only stays at that rate, happens to be concentrated in certain areas, and I get back to my very important point, which is that in those areas which have the greatest need, in those areas that will be affected most by the Gramm-Rudman cuts, those are the areas that already have been dumped on. They have already been declared triage areas. They are the areas where we have the highest unemployment. They are the areas where children are suffering most, and we have had several studies issued from different sources recently which talk about the fact that black children, among the children who are suffering, just as among the unemployed, we have a greater concentration among blacks. We also have a greater concentration of suffering and problems related to families and children among blacks.

The correlation is obvious. I would like to just read briefly from a summary of a report done by the Children's Defense Fund. This study, which was drawn from a variety of Government statistics, portrays a widening schism between black and white children in America. That schism is also true, as I said before, in employment.

Up until 1979, unemployment between blacks and whites, the ratio was less than 2 to 1. In 1979 we started a

situation where the unemployment rate in black communities was twice as high as that in white communities, and it has continued and is getting worse all the time.

The same is true of the plight of children, the problems suffered by black children. Black and white children in America are suffering disproportionately. The report concludes that during the past 5 years, black children have been sliding backward. These are the years under the Reagan administration. And they are increasingly suffering from inequality that denies opportunity to them in the millions. While focusing on black children, the study notes also that white children are also facing greater hurdles than in the past.

It found that white households headed by females under age 25 now have a poverty rate of 72.1 percent, and that 39.3 percent of all white female-headed families are in poverty. The report said that 16.9 percent of white families are poor and 12.3 percent of all teenage births are to whites. But the study noted that for black children in single-parent families headed by women under age 25, the poverty rate is 85.2 percent. The poverty rate for all families headed by black women is 63.7 percent.

The report also said there has been a dramatic decline in educational opportunities for black youth. In 1977, black and white high school graduates were equally likely to go on to college, 50 percent for blacks and about 51 percent for whites in 1977. By 1982, 52 percent of white high school graduates were going to college compared with 36 percent of black high school graduates.

Poverty appears to be the key to low college attendance rates among blacks, the report said. These facts require urgent community and national responses. The head of the Children's Defense Fund, Mrs. Marian Edelman, charged that the growing disparity between white and black children is in part a result of Reagan administration policies that have targeted poor children and families. Gramm-Rudman would target these same poor children and families even more.

Gramm-Rudman cannot cut anyplace in substance except those programs which are designed to serve the neediest persons. They have exempted defense contracts. They have exempted, and rightly so, Social Security. They have exempted the interest on the national debt. Where else will they cut? They will cut those programs which help the people who are in greatest need. They will cut those programs which are needed most by a population that has been triaged. The black population of America, more than 60 percent of whom are poor, have been labeled the group that can

be dumped overboard. We can do nothing about them or for them and they will hopefully just go away. Gramm-Rudman will complete this process, and for that reason Gramm-Rudman is not the framework that Democrats or anybody who is decent should be using to discuss the solution to the deficit problem.

There are other alternatives, other solutions, that should be considered and must be considered.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my question was: What are the other solutions? What is the Democratic plan for reducing the deficit? We have seen over the last several months a lot of talk from the gentleman's side of the aisle about reducing deficits, and this is the first plan that we have had. Now all we hear is the gentleman's criticism about the plan. There is no balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that comes out of his Committee on the Judiciary. We cannot get that considered.

What is the plan, beyond raising taxes? The gentleman told us that he was willing to hand over all the power of taxation to the President to raise taxes, and it seems to me that he is willing to weaken our defense by cutting defense spending. But beyond that, I do not hear any plan. What is the gentleman's plan to deal with congressional incompetence at cutting spending, and the fact that we have overspent our own budget—our own budget, mind you. Over the last 5 years, we have overspent our own budget by \$150 billion. What is the plan? Where are we going to deal with that?

Mr. OWENS. I do not have a plan.

Mr. WALKER. That is the trouble. Nobody has a plan on the gentleman's side.

Mr. OWENS. I do not think there is a plan. Nobody has a plan. I think the one good thing about the discussions that are taking place in conference is that there is a discussion going on. The danger is that that discussion will center around the Gramm-Rudman proposal.

□ 1815

That is the most possible plan that could be undertaken.

The kind of plan that should be undertaken should be using parameters that I have been discussing, and those parameters were set forth in the Congressional Black Caucus budget. The places to cut are the places where there is the greatest amount of money, money that is being wasted, money that is being wasted because of mismanagement, because of corruption in some cases, but most of all because

of wrong policy decisions. And those wrong policy decisions are the most costly of all.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is true, Congress has not succeeded in reducing the proposed expenditures. As we said earlier, as the gentleman from Texas agreed with me, the President has asked and Congress has voted virtually identical amounts in spending during Ronald Reagan's term. Congress has voted virtually identical amounts. There have been differences in the composition. President Reagan has asked for increases in some areas and cuts in others; Congress has had different priorities. But I think it is true both the President and the Congress have voted those very large sums.

The gentleman asked for a proposal to cut the budget. There has not been a unified opinion.

Mr. WALKER. To balance the budget was my statement.

Mr. FRANK. I believe the time is mine. The gentleman yielded to me.

The proposals have not come forward from either side of the aisle, they have not come from either branch, partly because it is difficult to get consensus.

But I would be glad to give the gentleman my proposals for it.

One thing with which I differed with the gentleman very greatly was when he suggested that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] was prepared to weaken our defense by cutting defense spending. I think that particular mindset that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] mentions is a substantial reason why we have the deficit we do. People who equate, as he does, and just did, quite unfairly, I think, to the gentleman from New York, reducing defense spending proposed by the Pentagon with weakening our defense are, I think, wrong. I do not think it weakens our defense to talk about efficiencies of the Pentagon, which virtually has been immune from them.

I thank the gentleman from New York, and he addressed this, he said he is for a strong defense, but he believes it would be possible substantially to reduce defense spending from the levels that have been asked for by Caspar Weinberger and the President, and voted by this Congress, without in any way weakening our defense.

Let us look at the Sergeant York, Divad, the gun they just canceled. Many of us have been voting against that gun for some years, and the Pentagon finally has admitted that we were right. Billions were wasted. We are still going to spend I do not know how many more millions of dollars in

canceling that gun because of the contracts that were signed.

I see the gentleman from Texas, and I know time is going to expire so I will relinquish. But I think the mindset that equates reducing defense spending with weakening America's defense that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has evinced is one of the reasons we have the deficit.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to specify.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

Mr. WALKER. We do not want to hear the specifics then?

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank both my colleagues, particularly my colleague from New York, Mr. OWENS, for allowing me this time, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for alerting me to this special order.

I know we do not have much time, so I would like to let the colloquy continue.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to give some more specifics.

The National Endowment for Democracy, a Ronald Reagan creation, \$200 million new dollars per year. Radio Marti, for which I voted, but if we are going to talk about high priorities, agricultural subsidies.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the Gramm-Rudman proposal is a clear and present danger to democracy in general and to the concept of the separation of powers in particular.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). All time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

GRAMM/RUDMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to continue the discussion that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] began on the Gramm-Rudman matter.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] at this point.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think it is important to specify that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] specifically referred to the Black Caucus budget when he referred to defense. When the Black Caucus budget was presented to this House, virtually all

major strategic weapons system of this country were eliminated. The MX system was eliminated, the B-1 bomber was eliminated. All the major strategic weapons systems of this country were eliminated as a part of that budget.

I would say that is a substantial weakening of the defense capacity of this country, and I do not think that relying on the B-52 bombers that are 30 years old, or relying on missile systems that are 20 years old and so on are in the best interest of a modernized defense force that is capable of meeting a Soviet challenge in the future.

I think it is extremely accurate to suggest that the gentleman is talking about a weakening of our defense forces rather than a mere cutback in waste, fraud, and abuse, unless you believe, as evidently the gentleman believes, that the entire strategic weapons program, modernization program of this country is, in fact, wasteful spending.

Mr. FRANK. I am going to yield to the gentleman in a minute, but I have not heard a more egregious misstatement in some time. The gentleman said that the Black Caucus budget—I did not vote for the Black Caucus budget this year. I voted for it in the past. I had some disagreements this year. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] said it would "eliminate the strategic weapons systems."

Mr. WALKER. I said modernization of strategic weapons systems.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman wants to make a restatement, OK. But the gentleman said on several occasions—

Mr. WALKER. I said modernization, the B-1—

Mr. FRANK. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. I yielded to the gentleman. He knows better. I do not understand what these tactics are about.

I yielded to the gentleman when he asked me to on several occasions. He may have had something else in mind, but people are not under the obligation of reading the gentleman from Pennsylvania's mind. The last time he referred to it, he referred to modernization. But the first three times he referred to it, he said eliminating all strategic weapons systems. That is obviously nonsense, and it is inaccurate, and I am glad that the gentleman protested when I quoted him, because he obviously wanted to say that he did not mean that. But it is that kind of misstatement that I think is embodied in the Gramm-Rudman situation.

No, the Black Caucus budget never tried to abolish all strategic weapons systems. And to have stated that is a terrible misstatement.

But beyond that, I have to reiterate that the mindset that thinks that cutting defense weakens defense I believe

is inaccurate, and I am glad to see in the other body the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Georgia, in fact, pointing out to an extent that there has been a weakening of defense by overspending. There are people in the other body who I think are quite accurately documenting now that the laxity that has marked this administration's control of the Pentagon budget has, in fact, contributed to some weakening. And I hope that we can support the effort to put more teeth into that.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. I said before we have a defense budget which is guilty of what social programs were accused wrongly of doing, and that is we throw money at social programs, and therefore, we made matters worse. We never threw dollars. We never threw enough dollars. We never appropriated enough dollars for social programs.

But certainly in the area of defense, the tremendous rapid buildup has caused a problem because it resulted in, it meant throwing dollars at defense problems. And we did not do very well because of those megabucks that were thrown at the problem.

I am not quoting people who put together the congressional alternative Black Caucus alternative budget, I am quoting military experts. The gentleman is in the minority when he says that the MX missile is a major strategic weapons system of this country. Most of the experts do not think the MX missile system is a major part of the strategic defense, though it is one of the most costly. Each missile costs \$75 million, and each silo it has to be put into, to prepare the silo costs another \$150 million. It is not a major strategic weapon.

The bottom line is that the people who are responsible for overseeing the defense systems of the United States, the people in the legislative branch, have now said that we have gross mismanagement, and that after all these expenditures, we have a defense that is weakened instead of strengthened because of mismanagement, and that no matter how much money you pour into this system, you will not get a stronger defense. We should be looking at the system and cutting out the places, cutting out the wasted dollars. The Sergeant York gun was referred to before. It took years of convincing the Pentagon before they finally acquiesced to eliminating that obviously lemon weapons system.

Now why cannot the Gramm-Rudman, or one of the parameters of Gramm-Rudman be a serious discussion about how we can move at a slower pace in dealing with our Defense Department and the moderniza-

tion of it or the strengthening of it, and stop throwing away dollars by moving too rapidly, and move at a slower pace, and take into consideration what the real military experts are saying about that system, and stop throwing dollars. If we stop throwing dollars, we will save a tremendous amount of money. That is where the megabucks are, in the Defense Department. We can save a tremendous amount of money, and if we do that, we do not have to dump them on the social programs. We do not have to continue to oppress those people most oppressed by the Reagan administration budget. That can be stopped because you can get the money from the source where the money is, and that is the Defense Department.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, again let me commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for bringing this matter before us, because this is a very serious concern that many of us are having, particularly the consternation we suffer with the rushed nature, the rushed character of what Gramm-Rudman means today.

Let me also thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for pointing out that the Congressional Black Caucus did not offer a budget that was replete or without strategic arms for the protection and the security of this Nation. The Congressional Black Caucus feels very strongly that we need to enhance the security of this Nation. We just happen to have a different view about how that needs to be done.

We do not believe paying \$6,000 for a toilet seat enhances the security of this Nation. We also do not believe that when you pay hundreds of dollars for nuts and bolts that cost 25 cents and 30 cents that it enhances the safety and security of this Nation.

The other thing I would like to point out is we feel very strongly, because of the experts that we have, that have given a preponderance of factual information about the MX missile system that, in fact, by the time it is completed that it would be antiquated and will be useless in the first place. We do not believe that is a matter of national defense.

We also, however, believe our highest priority in this Nation, our highest priority is that we ought to enhance the quality of life for all of our citizens. We feel very strongly our future is dependent upon, without question, the future of our young people. When we have in this Nation 35 million poor people, and that, by the way, represents a growing number of people, who are hungry, who are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-prepared to go to work and to become productive citizens be-

cause, in fact, we have not created any opportunities for them in this country, then that is a matter of national security that we ought to pay attention to.

What is happening is we have a growing number of children in our society who are suffering from malnutrition and hunger, and other diseases which I related to that malnutrition and hunger, and when we are, in fact, in a land of plenty and when we have paid billions of dollars of subsidies to farmers and ranchers to not grow food on their land and to not produce products that could feed these people, and when we store hundreds of thousands of metric tons of food that is rotting in silos today and we are not feeding our Nation, that is a matter of national security. It seems to me we ought to want to do all that we can to embellish the opportunities for these young children to grow to be strong individuals.

How is it that hungry children can go into the military and fight our wars for us, if, in fact, and God forbid us having to go to fight in a legal war anywhere in the world, or to protect the boundaries of this Nation. But the fact of the matter is that it seems to me that the priorities are a little bit screwed up somewhere in this Gramm-Rudman proposal in that it gives the President great latitude to do a lot of budget cutting, to continue his momentum in this budget cutting that he has engaged in over the last 5 years, and in these areas of national security that he seems not to care about, and that is the poor, the suffering people of our Nation who represent that 15 percent of our society that happens to be designated or declared poor. These are people who want to work, people who want to become productive citizens, young children who want to grow up healthy, not with stunted growth and ill minds, but rather with healthy bodies and healthy minds. That is a matter of national security.

This President, this administration, and through his conduits, Mr. GRAMM and Mr. RUDMAN and others in this body who are advocating this incredible latitude given to the President, for the so-called balanced budget, it seems to me is being, however, rather trancuous. I do not know if that is a word.

Mr. FRANK. It is now, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND. It is a matter of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so, therefore, it is a word. And pardon my limited vocabulary, if you will.

But let me also say that at the same time, this gives to the President this great latitude for cutting these budgets, it also constrains the President to give safe haven to those so-called strategic weapons that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has talked about so endearingly.

□ 1830

So I have a real problem. Our priorities are really screwed up somewhere, and what we have got to do is reorient our priorities, and I hope to God that by the time this process of this balanced budget exercise is over with, that indeed we have placed our priorities where they ought to be.

That is where the real security of our Nation is; that is with its citizens; the protection of the interest of not only the wealthy and those in the middle class who should be protected, but also with the poor people who need opportunities developed for them.

In the debate on the proposal some are forgetting the human consequences of the budget in the name of political expediency. It is very easy to stand up here and say how terrible it is that the Federal budget deficit is approaching \$200 billion, and how easy it will be to rectify this by mandating that \$36 billion a year for 5 years be lopped off the budget. But what these people who preach this doctrine seem to have overlooked is that among the devastating effects of Gramm-Rudman will be the fact that more people will go hungry, less school children will have a hot lunch, and more senior citizens will not receive adequate health care.

Proponents of the proposal say that we should turn over control of the budget to the administration when certain numerical deficit limits are breached. It is incredible that we are debating giving this power to a President who has shown virtually no concern for disadvantaged Americans. Time and time again we have had to fight Mr. Reagan on his attempts to overload his stockpile of weapons at the expense of needy Americans. Now it is proposed that if either the Congress or the President fail to meet the bill's year-by-year targets—or if the President chooses to veto a reconciliation measure—the President is given broad authority to make supposedly across-the-board cuts to meet those targets.

But closer scrutiny of the proposal reveals that a large number of the President's most prized defense programs would be shielded from cuts. One estimate puts the portion of the defense budget exempted from the automatic cuts at 38 percent, while 100 percent of the budget that aids low-income people would be unshielded. The burden of the cuts would be placed squarely on the shoulders of the poor, the sick, the elderly, veterans, and others who could not bear the weight of this load.

I am also concerned about the effect the bill would have on disadvantaged Americans if our economy enters a recession in the next few years, as some economists have predicted. As we all know, the Government's revenues fall during a recession and spending tends to rise as a result of a greater number of claims made for unemployment compensation and other assistance programs. If we are bound by law to make huge budget cuts at the same time as more Americans will require assistance as only the Government has the ability to

give, then we face social disaster. Under Gramm-Rudman, we would not have the power to quickly respond to the needs of our people.

Programs that aid the needy in this country frankly do not bear any responsibility for the soaring deficit. In the past 4 years, we have cut these programs to the bone and the deficit has still soared. Many opponents of this bill have attacked this proposal as unconstitutional, or as a way to force a tax increase. I oppose it simply because it would institutionalize drastic cuts in needed programs that aid poor and disadvantaged Americans.

There is no doubt that reducing the Federal deficit should be among the top priorities for this Congress. I will support balanced, fair, and reasonable measures to reduce the deficit. But those who have endured the cuts in social programs under this administration's misguided economic policies of the past 4 years are again being asked to bite the bullet. Mr. Speaker, these Americans can no longer bear the brunt of the President's budget cutting ax.

I join with my colleague from Massachusetts in proposing that antipoverty programs be exempted from any automatic budget cutting mechanism brought before the House. I commend his leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to join with us in this effort.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to stay accurate, I think we ought to remember with regard to the poor that the figure for the poor is not rising, it is dropping; according to the latest census data it dropped from 15 to 14 percent just in the name of accuracy and so on.

I think we also need to point out that if we are concerned about the defense part of this whole Gramm-Rudman proposal, 90 percent of the entire defense budget is included under Gramm-Rudman, would be eligible for cut; only 10 percent of the moneys for defense would be included under the protection simply because that is the money that is already contracted for. In other words, we are not going to go in and break contracts already made; but that represents a 10-percent solution, so that 90 percent of the defense budget, if we were worried about organization, would in fact be included under Gramm-Rudman. I think that that is probably a reasonable kind of approach.

I hope that the gentlemen on the other side are not suggesting that we ought not include Social Security under this blanket, because obviously—that is another thing. The interest on the national debt is an obligation incurred by this country to its people. It seems to me that that is something that is an obligation we have to carry out.

I also would just make the point that what I asked a little bit ago is whether or not there is a plan on the other side for balancing the budget. What I have gotten in return is a discussion of cutting defense and raising taxes. That was the proposal put forward by Walter Mondale that was rejected thoroughly by the American people in the last election.

The Democrats have not come very far since 1984 when 49 of the 50 States rejected that formula. What we are suggesting is, there is a new formula now; it is Gramm-Rudman; it is a potential, has the potential for balancing the budget. That is the direction that we ought to go; it includes all phases of Federal spending save those things where contracts were made, and I would remind the gentlemen on the other side that it also includes contracts made for those areas where social spending is incurring.

For example, if we have a contract for building a housing project, that is also excluded under the Gramm-Rudman proposal. Those are the kinds of things that need to be done.

So I think that it is a course of action that gives us an opportunity to perhaps move away from deficit, and I am very disappointed to hear only criticism and no alternative.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman was not listening to me, which I understand. I mentioned cuts in defense; I mentioned cuts in agriculture. The gentleman and I have disagreed; he so often voted for more agricultural spending than I have.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. FRANK. No, I just finished yielding to the gentleman for a very long time.

Mr. WALKER. But he needs to correct the record on that point.

Mr. FRANK. Will the gentleman please abide by the rules of the House. I do not understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks he is entitled to disregard the rules of the House at will; I have yielded to him twice now, he has spoken on my special order far more often than I have, I have yielded to him, he is now graciously allowing me to do what I have a right to do under the rules. I appreciate his graciousness.

I have disagreed with the gentleman on some areas of agricultural spending, where I believe he has been for more restrictive and more spending—I have talked about the National Endowment for Democracy; I have talked to Radio Martí; we have got foreign aid which could be reduced; I think we continue to give too much military assistance to the Philippines; I think there are other areas where we could be making some cuts.

So I would be prepared, over the 6-year period of Gramm-Rudman, yes, to come in with a deficit that had gone

to zero by talking about these areas. There are some tax increases I would be for. The cigarette tax, yes. I am for raising the cigarette tax. I think the President's adamant refusal to support an 8-cent increase in the cigarette tax, which we could use to help with Medicare, is very bad public policy.

I think to lobby for lowering cigarette taxes, as the President has been doing, when we know that that is causing illness and then the rest of us have to pay for those illnesses out of general taxes, I think that is quite foolish; and I think there are other areas of loopholes where we could in fact do some closing and raise some revenues and still be able to get some relief to people.

So I am prepared to talk about getting that deficit down to zero. I believe that there are billions that can be cut in agriculture and the military; you have to phase some of them in. In the agricultural areas, let us take the Payment-in-Kind Program. That was a Reagan administration special which we got. It cost us about \$12 billion, the Payment-in-Kind Program.

The Synthetic Fuels Program which finally the administration now is listening to some of us and getting ready to cut; the Synthetic Fuels Program is another \$15 billion deficit maker that I was in favor of cutting. So I think there are plenty of places where we can make those cuts, and I am going to be doing that.

Again, I have to make it clear: Congress and the President have been equal in the amount of spending. They have differed in the kinds of cuts they want.

I would be glad to continue with that list I started.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. No, I want to get back to the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman be instructed in the rules of the House, that when I have declined to yield—now, I have yielded to him twice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has the time.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has had more of my time than I have. It is apparently not enough for him.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman has made an accusation.

Mr. FRANK. What the gentleman is trying to do is to keep a point of view from which he disagrees from getting across. It is not becoming to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to continue deliberately to violate the rules of the House.

What I want to do, Mr. Speaker, and maybe this is why he is sort of unhappy; first of all, as far as Gramm-Rudman is concerned, the assertion that only 10 percent of the military is

uncovered by Gramm-Rudman's reduction is a new one to us. We have heard much bigger figures from the Senate themselves.

Now in fairness to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others, we ought to be clear that no one really knows what Gramm-Rudman says with any degree of certainty because it was a badly drafted, hastily drafted piece of legislation.

The estimates we have been getting in conference up until recently were that more than half of defense was covered; we were not sure how much is covered.

Yes; if we are going to have to do something like that I think all of the defense budget ought to be covered. I would also note that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had a great record for beating up a couple of strong men there; he valiantly defended against nobody cutting interest payments. No one was suggesting that.

As far as Social Security was concerned, I welcome the Republican Party in parts of this town to their relatively recent position for this year of not denying people Social Security benefits, because the President of the United States and a majority of the other party in the other body voted to cut Social Security. The other body voted to cut Social Security cost of living, the President backed that up; it was the resistance of the House that made them stop. So the House needs no instruction from other branches in protecting Social Security recipients.

Medicare, however, would not fare so well. Gramm-Rudman cuts medical care. It cuts Medicaid, it cuts Medicare. Sick, elderly people are hurt where defense contracts are sacrosanct.

A 75-year-old elderly woman needing hospitalization is going to be forced to pay more out of her own pocket; she may get less medical care while we protect other areas of this budget. That seems to me to be scandalous.

Let me talk about some more neutral figures, Mr. Speaker. Here are some letters that have been sent by people who have as their voluntary charge, concern for some of the neediest people in our society; sick people, people with illnesses, people who did not ask for the problems they have, but had them visited on them. Not usually thought of, I think, as militantly leftist organizations:

"On behalf of the United Cerebral Palsy Associations, consisting of 230 affiliates in 45 States, I want to express our outrage at the passage of the Gramm-Rudman amendment. United Cerebral Palsy's Association is a national organization concerned with needs of persons with cerebral palsy in their families." If the Gramm-Rudman amendment is enacted, as it came to us from the other body, "the

programs and services on which they depend will become virtually extinct."

The National Society for Children and Adults with Autism; people suffering from autism, people for reasons that none of us understand, at birth or later are afflicted with this condition; their parents—we do a little bit for them through the Federal budget. Here is what they have to say—this is not the AFL-CIO, this is not the Democratic Party; this is the National Society for Children and Adults with Autism:

The impact of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget amendment which passed the Senate on October 10th will be devastating to persons with autism and other handicaps.

What they are talking about, we should understand is, if there is a deadlock, under Gramm-Rudman, if the President decides to veto legislation that comes to him reducing the budget—by the way, under Gramm-Rudman as it came from the other body, even if both Houses of Congress agree to reduce the deficit, if the President does not like it, if we should cut the military too much and not cut programs for the needy enough, if we supply a little bit too much medical care for the elderly—we have done that; the President has been angry with us because we have resisted his efforts to cut medical care for the elderly, and instead we try to cut back on some of his extremely expensive military programs.

If the President thinks we have been harsh to the Pentagon and too kind to the elderly who are sick, he can veto that bill and trigger Gramm-Rudman. It would take a two-thirds vote to overcome it. That is what we are talking about; that is the shift of power. It allows the President to veto even a reduced amount, even a budget that came in with a relatively small deficit or a balanced budget, the President could veto it and trigger Gramm-Rudman, and then Gramm-Rudman, by exempting much of defense—and how much is not clear and the figure varies; but it exempts more of defense than virtually any other domestic program, because defense does more contracting.

□ 1840

Yes, there are contracts in housing, but there are not contracts in autism, there are not contracts in cerebral palsy, there are not contracts for poor pregnant women or for 2-year-old children who did not ask to be born but are born into circumstances that leave them dependent upon a little bit of compassion from the rest of us. They are going to be abused if the automatic cuts in Gramm-Rudman go into effect, and the President could trigger them.

You have the United Cerebral Palsy Association, the National Society for Children and Adults with Autism, the

National PTA, very much opposed to Gramm-Rudman because of the concern about the impact it would have on their ability to help provide education. That is the National PTA.

The National Association of Community Health Centers. Community health centers supply health care to some of the poorest and worst-served people in this society. Community health centers are a very low cost way of supplying medical care.

This approach to deficit reduction, quoting, not deficit reduction but this approach to deficit reduction will be greatly detrimental to those with the greatest need in our society. They are not opposed to reducing the deficit.

The National Association of Health Care Centers, the American Association of University Women, very concerned; finally, and this is by no means an exhaustive list but it is a list I happen to have at hand right now, the National Easter Seal Society. The National Easter Seal Society is concerned that this balanced budget legislation, not balancing the budget, but this legislation, could have very negative ramifications for people with disabilities.

You see, people with disabilities do not get entitled. They are not entitled to things. They have been cut back, but they are under some problems, that is, cerebral palsy, autism, the beneficiaries of the Easter Seals Program, they are wholly at the mercy of Gramm-Rudman. Defense is somewhat protected, maybe 10 percent, maybe 50 percent, we are not sure. And we are not sure from reading that. And the more you read Gramm-Rudman, the less you know about it, because it is not very well read. Remember, we did have a quote from the majority leader in the other body who said there is a problem because the longer this thing stays around, people are going to start reading it.

Yes, people started reading it. People from the Cerebral Palsy Association, people from the PTA, people from the Autism Society do not like what they see because, just to summarize, what Gramm-Rudman says is this: We should try through the normal processes to reduce spending. I am in agreement with that. I think President Reagan asked for far too much. I would like to see some domestic programs increased.

But I think if you look at the military budget, and we are talking about unnecessary weapon systems—let us just talk about the MX for a minute.

As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, the MX is now admitted by both Houses' majorities to be a failure. We are only going to have 50 of them. Now, nobody is for 50 MX's. There are some people who are for 200, some of us are for none, but there is no case to be made for 50. There is no strategic argument for 50. All you can do with

50 MX's is spend money on them. That does not make any sense. We are ending the program because people have admitted it does not make a great deal of sense. We talked about the Divad, the Sergeant York gun, which was a waste of money. There are weapons systems which are unnecessary. Then, in addition, there is the generally wasteful way in which the Pentagon has spent, leading the leaders of the other body in the Armed Services Committee, strong supporters of the Pentagon strategically, to say that this has got to stop, it has to be cut. As I said, areas in foreign assistance, some areas in foreign assistance, are very important; some areas in foreign assistance, the money is being very sloppily run and wasted. New Reagan initiatives like Radio Marti and the National Endowment for Democracy, not in and of themselves bad, but more important? Radio Marti? Again, I voted for it. But is that more important than people with autism? That is what we are talking about. To Ronald Reagan it is, because under Ronald Reagan new multimillion-dollar, hundred-million-dollar programs, come from the National Endowment for Democracy.

I was at the Democratic Committee gala the other night. I met with some very nice people. They were politicians from a friendly country. I was delighted to have dinner with these people. I had a nice chat with them. They did not understand my English too well, but neither do some of my colleagues. I understood that. I do not take offense. I had a very nice talk with some of these people. They are here with money from the National Endowment for Democracy.

Now, I was glad that they were here, but why are we spending taxpayers' money to bring these people over here to have a nice chat over dinner with me, given by the Democratic National Committee? And we are not spending enough, we are putting people in fear; there are people out there who are trying to work with kids who have cerebral palsy, people at the health centers who are trying to provide medical care for frightened elderly people who have no resources, who do not want to totally impoverish themselves and be ready for Medicaid. We have to cut back on them; they have to worry about where their next dollar is coming from. But we can bring people over here to have dinner with me.

Those are all Reagan's priorities, because he has been a strong supporter of the National Endowment for Democracy, and of Radio Marti, and of aid to President Marcos.

Now, the President sent the Senator from Nevada over there to tell President Marcos to please behave, but he is also sending him a couple of hundred million dollars a year. I do not

think that is inductive to great good behavior.

But, at any rate, what we have is, under Gramm-Rudman, no matter what Congress says, this is what our problem is, no matter what Congress says about reducing spending, if the President does not like our priorities, if he thinks we have denied defense too much or we have denied President Marcos a little extra money, we have not put enough into Radio Marti, and I do not know what comes next, but if we have denied those priorities and instead we put too much into autism, into cerebral palsy, and Medicare, he can veto the bill, and he then triggers an across-the-board reduction that does not go across the board because it exempts anywhere from 10 to 50 or 60 percent of defense, depending on what it is; it exempts agricultural subsidies. I am not sure whether some of them are or are not exempt. Some of the subsidies for wealthy people may well be exempted. It exempts all of Social Security. I am glad it does. I was appalled when the President and the other body wanted to cut Social Security cost of living early this year, but it does not exempt Medicare. I talked to a lot of elderly people in my district, and, yes, it is nice to have the Social Security check, but they live in mortal fear, people in their seventies and eighties, of what happens when they get sick. Under the priorities they have already gotten from this administration, they have to spend more and more out of their own pockets for less and less medical care, but we have 50 MX missiles. There is not a thing in the world we can do with them that makes any sense. Everyone admits that strategically; no one has recommended 50. We have 50, and we are going to pay for more.

The defense budget goes up; agricultural subsidies under Ronald Reagan, by this statistics, more than tripled over what they were in the previous 5 years. He tried to cut them this year, and I tried to help. Earlier he was not so hot on cutting spending. He has been on again, off again; the President was for the Sugar Program and he was against the Sugar Program, depending on what deals he made here. But that is a legitimate part of the President's proposals.

But where has been the concern for the neediest? Every organization that has taken on an obligation to protect the very ill, the elderly, the vulnerable, is frightened by Gramm-Rudman, not because they do not want to reduce the budget deficit but because they do not want it to be done in an unfair way. They do not want substantial parts of the budget, those that have already been over-financed in many ways, exempted in substantial part while they are left totally vulnerable. And the budget proposal that says the President can veto that, the

President can veto a balanced budget if Congress sent him one; he could veto the budget with the budget halved over what it had been because he did not like it, it did not have enough money for the star wars missile or the MX missile and has too much for Medicare and for chapter I for those people who need educational assistance; he could veto that and, instead, trigger reductions across the board that do not go across the board because they protect certain of his programs.

Now, we have a conference going on that I hope will be able to make some improvements in that very shoddy piece of legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding. On that last point, it is my understanding that the President presents a budget to the Congress, it has to be within these deficit ceiling limitations. Congress can rearrange those if it sees fit, as long as it is a zero-sum gain. Every reduction in one program is offset by an increase in another program. But once the Congress passes the budget, so long as it is within the deficit ceiling, it is my understanding that the President cannot veto that. He can submit the original budget to the Congress, but once—

Mr. FRANK. He can veto the reconciliation bill that would be necessary to carry that out and therefore prevent that from effectuating what we say and cause those problems. The veto could prevent that from accomplishing the program.

Now, if the gentleman is agreeing with me that maybe—

Mr. BARTON of Texas. That is a different kind of a veto, that is not within the meaning of the Deficit Reduction Emergency Act.

Mr. FRANK. It is a veto. There is only one kind of veto, when the President does exercise a veto and we need two-thirds to override him. And as Gramm-Rudman comes over to us, there are times when a Presidential veto can trigger that automatic reduction process because he can veto the reconciliation. If there is agreement that that should not be the case, I accept the fact it is not always easy to follow every little bit of Gramm-Rudman because, as I said, it was very hastily drafted and we were not sure what is meant there. The Senate conferees have been unable to explain to the House conferees. But if there is agreement, that is one of the improvements we can make.

Let me say that the gentleman said to me before we were told by the initial calculations—you read the language, and the language does not tell you a lot, that is part of the problem. There is not a great committee report on this. If we can get defense not exempted, if we have that there is no

Presidential veto in any way can trigger this, then we are making some progress. But that is not my understanding of the way Gramm-Rudman has come over.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I understand I am on the gentleman's time. I appreciate him yielding once again.

One of the concerns expressed against Gramm-Rudman which I believe the gentleman expressed and some of the other gentlemen earlier in the evening was that the constitutionality of it, I am sorry I cannot pronounce that like it is—

Mr. FRANK. Let me reclaim my time. I never expressed concern about the constitutionality.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But I would have a concern if you are saying that one of the recommendations, one of the improvements, would be to implement a provision that would prohibit a Presidential veto because Presidential veto is in our Constitution.

Mr. FRANK. I understand that. I have to take back my time. If the gentleman wants to be beat strawmen, I recommend he find a field somewhere. We have had enough of that.

I was never suggesting that we should in any way reduce the Presidential veto. We cannot reduce the Presidential veto. As a matter of fact, the Chadha decision of the U.S. Supreme Court made very clear there are absolute limits on our ability to even do any kind of legislative veto in this situation.

My point is not that we should impinge on the Presidential veto, but we should not have something which could be triggered by one.

As I read Gramm-Rudman, a Presidential veto over a reconciliation bill could trigger the automatic deficit reduction. If the President did not like what we did and vetoed the reconciliation bill, we could go into an automatic situation. I think that is a mistake. I think we should not make have a trigger of any kind that could trigger a Presidential veto.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I just wanted to address the question or the point that you raised that at least some people are implying—

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman may finish, but I just want to make it clear that no, I am not taking away the President's veto; I am not for painting the White House purple; I am not for kicking Ronald Reagan's dog. I trust that I have divested myself of all the charges, which I must say to the gentleman seem to be of equal intellectual weight. What I said was that under Gramm-Rudman there are circumstances in which a Presidential veto, not of the concurrent resolution which I agree is not vetoable, but of a reconciliation bill, could cause the automat-

ic reduction to go into effect. I do not like that because that seems to me to be a mistake.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I have several points. With a veto provision we do have the opportunity of overriding that veto, No. 1. No. 2, we do have the opportunity of coming back with another reconciliation bill.

Mr. FRANK. I will yield to the gentleman again on defense, but I want to make it clear, and I appreciate the gentleman from Florida agreeing with me, that the veto does have a role to play, the Presidential veto.

Mr. MACK. The veto has always had a role to play.

Mr. FRANK. I understand that. But I understand that the gentleman from Texas, before the gentleman from Florida got here, the gentleman from Texas was suggesting that I was wrong to say the veto would be a factor. We have now established that it is a factor, that the veto of a reconciliation bill would trigger it. Yes, we have the right to override a veto, but that takes two-thirds, and when you shift from a majority to two-thirds you are giving the President a great deal of power.

We can override a veto, but when you need a majority in one case to establish it and two-thirds in another, you have given the President a very substantial gain in power.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. OK. I would like to move to the question about defense because it has been an area that I think has been misunderstood. It goes back to the outlining of one of the exemptions that has been provided which is basically contracting or contracts, multiyear contracts where the assumption was that if by voiding or by causing an action where we would be open for suit by the person that we have contracted with, that we could increase—if I may finish.

Mr. FRANK. Or if there was a penalty. There are two factors, penalty or a suit.

Mr. MACK. Exactly. The conclusion was that most of those defense contracts were going to be exempt. That is what the first run-through on that was. So people came out and said, "Look, wait a minute, that contracting provision was put in there solely for the purpose of exempting defense or trying to reduce the burden of deficit reduction on defense," and, therefore, many people came out and said that we are not going to support it.

What I said to you is, during the conference there have been a number of statements made both by Democrats and Republicans that indicate now that really 90 percent of the contracts on defense are included, that only roughly 10 percent are excluded, basically because the provisions in the

defense contracts say that they can be cancelled at the convenience of the Congress. And it is of the opinion now that most of those contracts are in, defense would play a major portion in the reductions in the deficit. This has not been set up as a means to protect the defense dollar. Those are the provisions as stated in the conference during the last several days.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman. A couple of things: First of all, it is indicative of the problems we have had with the drafting that we have had shifting analyses of what the contracting provision means. That is why I have been using the figure, 10 percent to 50 percent, because I do not think anybody really knows. It has not been analyzed yet.

Second, given the way they are running the Pentagon, I would not be at all surprised to see some new contracts signed, if in fact this is continued, which would make it hard for us to do that. There is nothing that would prevent the Pentagon from shifting that language. But the Gramm-Rudman language, as it now is, if we are intending to cover only 10 percent of the Pentagon, then I think we had better say that, because if we leave it open to interpretation we will have some problems.

The other thing is, if 10 percent of the Pentagon is exempted, then 10 percent of other things ought to be exempted. The fact is that when you exempt contracts, and I understand the reason for exempting contracts, but because the Pentagon uses contracts more than virtually any other area of Government expenditure, to the extent that you protect contracts you protect the Pentagon more.

□ 1855

But that is one area that has to be clarified.

If the gentleman would agree with me, I am hoping maybe we are reaching some agreement. I still do not know where we are on the veto, but I will get back to that in a second. Let me ask the gentleman from Florida, is he agreeing that defense ought not to be any more protected by this, in percentage terms, than any other program? Does the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MACK. Our feeling is that defense ought to play an equal role in deficit reduction. It should not be protected any more or any less than any other program.

Mr. FRANK. I am glad to hear that, because that was not what initially we had, and I hope the gentleman is speaking for the other body. I am not sure of that. But I think that is a very real change from when Gramm-Rudman came over. As the gentleman has acknowledged, we were initially being told by the authors of it over in the Senate that in fact it protected a

lot more of defense. If we are now being told, well, no, defense is going to be equally vulnerable, I think that should be OK, and it may get us closer. I yield again.

Mr. MACK. Well, my point is that there are areas on the domestic side that are probably more protected than defense. Our intention was to come up with a reasonable, rational approach in making the exemptions, and the feeling was that if we have made legitimate contracts, that if there was an action on our part that would initiate some form of penalty that would end up costing us more in the long run, that we ought to exempt those, that we are really fooling ourselves to say on one hand we are going to reduce these contracts and then have to turn around at a later date and increase the cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. FRANK. I understand that.

Mr. MACK. A straightforward, honest approach, in trying to make sure that everything as much as possible is included in the pie.

Mr. FRANK. I thought we had an agreement, but it slipped away from me, because that is the problem. I thought the gentleman was agreeing with me that defense ought to be vulnerable, to the extent that every other program is vulnerable; but defense uses contracts more than other programs do. And if we are going to protect defense to that extent—

Mr. MACK. It is the other way around.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman would like me to yield, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. MACK. I would like the gentleman to yield.

My intention, Mr. FRANK, was really to try to get to some understanding of what we are doing. I realize there have been times when this body has had to move rather rapidly. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are certainly aware of situations where we have come out here on the floor and did not have the opportunity to at least have as much a dialog as we are having here tonight to discuss other issues which the gentleman's party has brought to the floor with no advance notice.

Mr. FRANK. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman, but I do have limited time. I appreciate his taking my time to tell me how much he appreciates taking my time, but I think we ought to get back to the substance. So why don't we get back to defense.

Mr. LELAND. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. FRANK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas. Just before I do, for 1 second, I will say that one thing I think ought to be very clear: Complaints about legislation without hearings, legislation being too rapid, I would hope nobody would utter too

many of those with a straight face, because my experience in the 5 years I have been here is that individuals on either side tend to be for or against regular order, depending upon what happens subsequently. That is not a bad way to go about it, but the gentleman's little side excursion as to when legislation comes up or not comes up, that is not my problem. My problem is the substance of this legislation, which I am still trying to understand. I just want to reiterate, before yielding to the gentleman from Texas, my point was that to the extent you exempt contracted material, you are giving the Pentagon a much better break than you are autism or cerebral palsy, because we do not sign contracts with autism or cerebral palsy. And I think a deficit-reduction proposal that has people from the autism group and the cerebral palsy group and the Easter Seals group worried because they are not only going to have to take their share of the cut, they are going to have to take the share of the protected defense contract, that is a very bad piece of legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LELAND. I would just like to again thank the gentleman for his leadership. I cannot stay any longer, but I would just like to ask the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle if at some point in their history in being in Congress would they show as much concern about the hungry, the sick, the people afflicted with autism, and the other problems that afflict the lower end of the spectrum of people in our country, the poor and the desperate people, as much as they address the issue of defense spending and how much more we ought to be spending on defense, as much as they would ask the Congress to appropriate more money for those incredible weapons that they were talking about. Are they willing to also advocate the increase in spending for the nutrition programs for the young children of our country who are suffering? Are they going to ask for more moneys for senior citizens programs?

This morning, under the leadership of the chairman of the domestic section of the Select Committee on Hunger, Mr. PANETTA, we held a hearing on hunger in Appalachia, and person after person who came from Appalachia told us about the problems they were suffering, in terms of malnutrition amongst the children there, in particular, and how children have to go to sleep after having eaten potato soup and beans and bread, and drink a lot of water just so that they can feel full and wake up the next morning feeling they may have had something to eat the day before. We heard a young child who is 13 years old say that they only get two glasses of milk a month, if that much.

I hear all of the problems of the deficit, and so forth, and I am concerned about that, too, because I do not want to mortgage the future of America. I want to see a balancing of the budget. But I do not ever hear from that side of the aisle enough in terms of balance, about how we are going to protect the interests of these people. I am talking about not only the 35 million people—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated that the numbers have gone down, that there are fewer poor people. Let me suggest to the gentleman that our figures are showing that there is an increase in poverty in this Nation. The figures have dropped in the last 2 years from 15 percent to 14.7 percent, not from 15 percent to 14 percent; that, in fact, there are 35 million poor people in this country, but also the private voluntary organizations who are handling the soup kitchens and the food pantries and things like that in this country are asking for more and more support because they lack the kind of support from the Federal Government now, and because of those budget cuts in those areas for nutrition and feeding people, in fact the burden is shifting to the private sector. But there are more and more people who need food to eat and they cannot afford it because they do not have the kinds of jobs necessary in order to feed their families.

The point I am making is that I hear all the time the rhetoric about balancing the budget on the other side of the aisle, I hear all the time about how we need to increase defense spending, but I do not hear enough from that side of the aisle that we even care about these people, and I just wonder where that is coming from.

Mr. FRANK. I have about 15 minutes left, and I will yield a piece of it first to the gentleman from Florida and then the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MACK. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the comments that the gentleman from Texas has made. We have known each other for a relatively short period of time, and I am convinced of his sincerity. The only thing I would say is to at least give me the same courtesy. I feel as strongly as you do. We have a disagreement about what is the best way to get there. And I think that is a legitimate difference of opinion.

Mr. LELAND. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will further yield, I would just like to say to the gentleman that all I ask for is for you to be as preponderant in your suggestions about what options we have for taking care of these people as you have done with the preponderance of suggestions about how we increase defense spending, how we cut programs. I am saying we are looking for alternatives. I agree that the gentleman is as sincere as I am, at least from my conversations

with him in that short period of time that we have known each other, but I do not hear that on the floor of this House, I do not hear it from that side of the aisle, about what is happening to these poor people. And maybe with the kind of dialog that you could create by giving us some information about your alternatives, maybe then we on this side of the aisle would buy some of the options that you put forth. But I have not heard those options.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding.

I have a question for my distinguished colleague from Texas. I have followed his career first in Austin, where he served in the State legislature, and then here in Washington where he preceded me. I understand his concern. I share those concerns. But my question is: You had the same concern, I would hope, when you were a State legislator in Austin, TX, and during that time period you operated under a balanced-budget requirement.

Mr. LELAND. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield further, we in my first session of the legislature established zero-based budgeting for the purpose of balancing the budget in the State of Texas. And I agreed with that. I do not disagree with that now. But at the same time we did not go in with a meat ax and cut all of those programs out, because we were under Federal mandate. So you cannot necessarily equate the situation with what was going on in the State of Texas with what is going on here.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield for an additional comment, in my opinion—I understand there is a concern and a disagreement about the provisions of Gramm-Mack—there are those, and I am one, who think that this is a very fair proposal because it does cut proportionately across the board. It exempts one program, Social Security, because it has a dedicated trust fund. Now, we do not know to what percentage there are contracts that are not affected in defense, in the social program, but the language—and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts point it out to me, where his concern is on the definition. It does not say "Defense Department." It strictly mentions contracts. And I feel that we can, by working through the conferees in the conference committee, get the facts on those concerns. And if it appears that there is a disproportionate number of contracts that are exempt under defense as opposed to, say, health and human services, we can remedy that.

Mr. FRANK. Again the gentleman has refuted the unuttered. No one said that referred only to defense. My

point on several occasions was that defense uses contracts more than any other programs, and therefore exempting contracts will protect defense more than it will protect many of these other programs.

But I want to get back to my central concern. On the other hand, I do want to acknowledge the gentleman from Texas—and I appreciate what he had to say—yes, if that is his intention—and it did not come that way from the other body. When that first came from the other body, we were being told by Members of the other body that defense was more protected than other things. If there is a willingness to see defense is treated equally with the FBI, with Environmental Protection, with other things, then we move closer. There is still the problem of the veto. There may have been some confusion, from the technicalities, but I think we are in agreement that while the President cannot veto the concurrent resolution, he has his unimpeachable constitutional right to veto the reconciliation bill, and his veto of a reconciliation bill could trigger the automatic reduction, even if Congress had come up with some reductions, if the President did not like the priorities. That is the point I want to make. We are not debating whether or not to reduce the deficit. We are debating the priorities.

I am afraid I will not be able to yield any more. I have much less than half of my own time so far, and I only have a few more minutes before I am finished. I want to get back to one of my major concerns about this.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a correction?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman mentioned a little bit ago agriculture, and he said that he had supported many cuts in agriculture he did not think this gentleman supported. I wonder if he would specify that.

Mr. FRANK. Marketing orders was one of the ones that I had in mind.

Mr. WALKER. Where have I not supported cuts in marketing orders?

Mr. FRANK. I thought the gentleman was for several of the marketing orders to which I was opposed, which I have found to be anticonsumer. If I am wrong, I apologize. I remember a conversation with the gentleman about marketing orders where I thought he was supportive in the dairy area and otherwise. If that is inaccurate, then I am inaccurate.

Mr. WALKER. I would appreciate if the gentleman would correct the record. I voted for the Olin-Michel amendment on the floor the other day.

Mr. FRANK. No; I am talking about marketing orders, marketing orders in various commodities. We had the fight about whether or not OMB could deal

with marketing orders or not. Let me say I will withdraw the comment. I will doublecheck the RECORD.

Mr. WALKER. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that when we had the agriculture bill on the floor the other day I voted for the cuts, and I think that agriculture is one of the areas where we could find some cuts.

Mr. FRANK. Well, I agree.

Mr. WALKER. Did the gentleman mention the National Endowment for the Arts?

Mr. FRANK. No; I did not.

Mr. WALKER. The National Endowment for Democracy. I am sorry. That is another place where we can cut.

Mr. FRANK. I will take back my time because, as I have said, I have yielded more than half my time. The National Endowment for Democracy—I am glad the gentleman agrees with me on that. I was not suggesting that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not agree. The gentleman asked where I would cut the budget and I am telling him where I would cut the budget. One of those areas is the National Endowment for Democracy. I pointed out—not that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was its sponsor—that Ronald Reagan has been an advocate—

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. No; I will not yield again.

The gentleman wants me not to get to the point I want to make, and I understand that, but I am going to do that.

The National Endowment for Democracy, we agree, apparently, is a waste, but it is Ronald Reagan's waste, to a great extent, as are many of these other areas.

The point we have to deal with in Gramm-Rudman which Members would like obscured is we want to go back to the people who have written, cerebral palsy, autism, these are programs that are unprotected, these are programs which are small compared to the MX missile, compared to various parts of the Foreign Assistance Program, compared to the payment-in-kind agricultural boondoggle which the Reagan administration gave us of \$12 billion. They have already been, in my judgment, disproportionately reduced. The deficit has gone way up in the past 5 years, the joint product of the President and the Congress. There is no point in finger pointing. The deficit has been a joint product of the President and the Congress. The President has asked Congress to spend virtually the same amount Congress has spent. We spent it a little differently than he would have had us spend it, but it is virtually the same.

□ 1910

The President has vetoed virtually no appropriation bills. So we have a

joint product of President and Congress, and it is a deficit that is causing us damage, and that we think has to be reduced.

How do we reduce it is the question. The problems with Gramm-Rudman are several in my judgement. One, it allows by the use of the Presidential veto, the President to block a congressional enactment reducing that budget deficit somewhat if it does not meet his priorities, and it is therefore relevant to look at his priorities.

His priorities have been excessive spending in the Pentagon by the judgment I think by now most Members of both Houses, because this year, after all that increased expenditure in the Pentagon, the majority of both Houses said no, you are going way too far and we are not going to give you that much. They have included foreign assistance to the Philippines; the National Endowment for Democracy; Radio Marti; the Payment-in-Kind Program. These are the President's programs. The Synthetic Fuels Program, which he is, I hope, beginning to turn around on now, but which was a multibillion-dollar excessive expenditure. The Clinch River breeder reactor. Water projects in some cases that were unnecessary.

Many of us feel it would be a grave error to allow his veto to be interposed, and again, we are not talking about his vetoing because we are spending too much; we are talking about the authority Gramm-Rudman gives him to object to a congressional deficit reduction bill, not because it does not reduce the deficit enough, and let us be very clear: Ronald Reagan has criticisms to make of the way Congress has spent money. But if you look at what he has asked us to spend, we spent virtually the same as what he has asked us. So his criticisms are not in what we spent but how we spent it.

To allow him to interpose his veto when he has been for the MX missile, an unnecessary weapon, while he has been trying to Medicare, medical care for the elderly poor, we think is a mistake. Beyond that, we have the problem of the most vulnerable people in our society. People with autism; people with cerebral palsy. Eighty-three-year-old women living on supplemental security income because the pension that her husband was supposed to get or she was supposed to get did not show up because of a company bankruptcy.

A 2-year-old child who did not ask to be born but is born into unfortunate circumstances to a couple of careless teenagers. These are the people who would bear very much of the brunt of Gramm-Rudman. Even if it is done across the board and in the form in which it came to us from the other body, we were not told it was across

the board, we were told that a substantial amount of defense would be protected.

Even if you do it across the board, we have spent 5 years cutting already. Poor, pregnant women get less help than they used to. Children having trouble learning in low economic areas get less than they used to. The deficit has gone up and up because the Pentagon has done very well; agricultural subsidies have more than tripled; new programs like the National Endowment for Democracy have come, but the very poorest people in this society, and by the way, there is debate about some of the poor. Some people might find some of the poor unworthy, some of them worthy. Let us just focus on those whom I think there is no debate about. Eighty-three-year-old women living on minimum income because they had no pension through no fault of their own. They worked hard all of their lives and the pension just was not there. If the automatic reductions of Gramm-Rudman go into effect, they get hurt. Their medical care is cut. Their income may be cut. The cost-of-living increase that they are legally entitled to if they are on supplement security income will be cut.

It does not seem to many of us fair to continue that set of priorities. It does not seem fair to exempt some percentage of defense because they have to use contracts, but to exempt nothing at all in some of these other areas, and that is what we are being told will happen.

Medicare and Medicaid, yes, we needed cost controls. We have made some progress in getting cost controls. We need more progress. But Gramm-Rudman does not mandate cost controls. Gramm-Rudman does not speak to efficiency. It says if the President does not like the spending priorities of Congress, if Congress meets the targets of Gramm-Rudman in reducing deficits, if Congress does it in a way that the President does not like, if for instance, instead of cutting Medicare and President Reagan has every year asked us to cut Medicare, if instead of cutting Medicare, we raise the cigarette tax by 8 cents, and put that into the Medicare budget, President Reagan would not like that. He is vehemently opposed to that. He wants to cut Medicare and not raise cigarette taxes. That is his position; no one doubts that.

If Congress achieved the same amount of deficit reduction as the President by rejecting his proposed cuts in Medicare and instead substituting an 8-cent increase in the cigarette tax, he could veto the bill and by vetoing the bill trigger the automatic reduction which is what has got the people who are concerned about autistic children and people with cerebral palsy worried, which has got the American Association of Retired Per-

sons worried because of what it will do to Medicare and Medicaid and other programs for the medically ill.

I do believe that there is plenty of room to reduce the deficit. Yes, we talked about revenues. I am prepared to vote for an increase in cigarette taxes; I think that would be good for our society to do that. Not only would it bring more revenue, but to the extent that it discouraged smoking, we would be a healthier and a better society. Not by a compulsion, but by asking people who smoke to bear a fairer share of the costs that are inevitably imposed on society through smoking.

We can cut in the military; we can cut in foreign assistance; we can cut in water projects. We can cut in other areas. We can cut in areas of general government. If we are in a crisis, that is OK. But to tell the people who are working with the poorest and most vulnerable, to tell the poor children and the sick elderly and people suffering, parents who have autistic children, parents who have severely retarded children that the already inadequate help that they get in my judgment is going to be further cut, while we protect some percentage of defense, we are not clear what percentage, but to protect some percentage of defense and put the retarded children and their parents at great risk is not, I think, morally acceptable.

Yes, it is important to reduce the deficit, but I think this country has got both the economic and intellectual resources and I hope the moral resources to do it in ways that do not damage these individuals.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. A quick question. Suppose the President did veto a budget reconciliation bill that was in the deficit targets, he could do that under our Constitution, but none of the automatic cuts would go into effect because the budget would already be within the deficit target.

Mr. FRANK. But the budget could not be within the target unless we were able to do reconciliation. Simply adopting a budget which sets it but not being able to accomplish it would not work.

Suppose we reached that deficit reduction by a cigarette tax increase. I take something that is a real issue between many of us in Congress and the President. Some of us think we should not allow cigarette taxes to drop. The President wants cigarette taxes to be lower than they now are, which is what the law has said it should be. We had a temporary increase. Some of us think that temporary increase should be made permanent. If we are not able to achieve our deficit reduction because the President vetoes an increase in the cigarette tax because he would rather cut Medicare, then that could

trigger the automatic reduction, and that is the problem we have got.

We cannot simply say we are going to have it to stave off those automatic reductions; we have to accomplish it. By letting the President veto, you would allow him to prevent us from achieving it. That, I submit to the gentleman, is a very real possibility. We try to raise the cigarette tax to pick up a little more revenue. The President says no, you better cut Medicare instead. He vetoes the increase in the cigarette tax, and that could put us over the top.

□ 1920

PROPOSED SANCTIONS AGAINST ANGOLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a piece of legislation that would ban all loans from the United States to the country of Angola, would ban future investment by United States business interests in the country of Angola, and would require the President to declare an embargo on all trade between our two countries in regard to the country of Angola until certain conditions were met, namely, that certain troops that are in that country from other Communist countries—Cuba, the Soviet Union, East Germany—be withdrawn, that Angola recognize the human rights violations which it has committed and take effective steps to cease and desist those activities, and that certain other conditions be met that were set forth in the legislation, including free elections, and that an opportunity to discuss opposition parties within that country be developed.

The reason for this legislation is fairly simple, and before I get into that I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of my remarks, during this special order time, I shall insert into the Record for printing a copy of the legislation itself.

Mr. Speaker, Angola is a country that is roughly the size of Texas and New Mexico combined. It has a population of about 6 million people. Until 1975 it was under the control as a colony of Portugal. Since 1975, although there has been an ongoing civil war between the two leading contenders for power in that country, for all practical purposes most of the country has been under the control of a Communist regime under the Government entitled the "Popular Movement for the Independence of Angola," and during my remarks I am going to simply refer to the MPLA as

"the Government," since it is in fact considered to be just that.

The opposition forces that still exist in that country and have been fighting the anti-Marxist forces, the forces of Jonas Savimbi, are under a party that has been called the Union for the Total Independence of Angola, UNITA, and for the purposes of simplicity in this discussion, I am simply going to refer to them as "the Savimbi forces."

After 1975 the Government of Angola proceeded on a path that has indeed squelched human rights as we know them today: there is no freedom of press; there is no real freedom in that country for political association; there is no real freedom in that country for people to express their views in even the simplest of ways, including artistic form. The fact is that Amnesty International recently has engaged itself in the exploration of what the problems are in Angola, and it has confirmed, as well as our State Department, that human rights abuse is the norm in the nation. The torture, imprisonment, and execution of political prisoners is thoroughly documented by Amnesty International and our own State Department.

The fact of the matter is that Angolans are sick and starving due to the harshness of the African drought this year, and yet the Angolan Government, which exported over 1 billion dollars, worth of oil to the United States last year alone, cannot afford to care for its people. The country is an impoverished shambles, and we need to pay more attention to what is going on over there.

The reason for this legislation is in part because of these human rights violations, because of the situations in that country. But more to the point, this legislation that I have introduced to bring about economic sanctions on Angola has been brought to my mind to do because of the growing conflict within that country of a Soviet presence in trying to help the Angolan Government stamp out the rebel forces that are opposed to Marxism, because of the development over the last few months of the increased stepped-up activity of this effort on the part of the Soviet Union and the obvious use of Angola by the Soviets now in a form of its international efforts to try to bring about a world order of communism.

I want to talk for a few minutes about those efforts and what has gone on in the context of the history of this country. For about 10 years this country has been under the Marxist rule of this current government. The Soviet Union has been present during most of that time. However, the fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union's involvement has increased of late.

In 1976 or so, at the instigation of the Soviets, the Cubans put about

25,000 or 26,000 troops into Angola. Today there are about 35,000 or 36,000 Cuban troops in Angola. If it were not for these Cuban soldiers in Angola, the present government could not exist; they could not sustain their operations.

The Soviet Union itself has become more involved directly in the last few years. It has advisers or military experts and actual soldiers there numbering some 1,500 or so at the present time, and I am told the best estimates are that there are about 2,500 East Germans in the country.

In 1983 there was a battle or two that was waged in the country between the forces of Savimbi and the forces of Angola, and during the fall the Soviets put in a good deal of armament and stepped up the supplies to that country. They put into the country T-62 tanks, they in Mig-23 jet fighters, they put in SU-22 fighter-bombers, they put in M-125 helicopter gunships, and more recently they have installed an air defense line in southern Angola, deploying radars and SA surface-to-air missiles. That was all in November and December of 1983.

Now, after that occurred, the Soviets were caught a little bit by surprise when the South Africans entered the scene chasing some terrorists north into Angola, and the Angolan Government decided in December of 1983 to come to an accord with the South Africans and agree not to continue to support the terrorists that had been using their border area for an enclave to make raids into South Africa, in return for South Africa's withdrawing its forces completely from the area.

The Soviets were not too happy with that, and they decided to get much more involved directly, and in 1984 and 1985, they did exactly that. As a matter of fact, in 1984 and 1985, as of August of this year, the Armed Forces of the Government of Angola had on hand over 500 Soviet tanks, including 30 T-62's, over 100 sophisticated Soviet fighter aircraft, including about 30 Mig-23's and 70 Mig-21's, and roughly 25 deadly M-125 helicopter gunships. The total value of these armed transfers has been estimated at between \$1 billion and \$2 billion, those transfers being the ones occurring in 1984 and early 1985.

Then in late July, a major offensive began between forces of the Government, the Communist Government of Angola, against Savimbi and his forces that controlled a small portion of the country in the interior and the southern regions. At that time, the Soviets had four commanders in the field directing the Government brigades, four brigades of the Angolan Army, and the Cuban soldiers that were involved in this battle were directed by Soviet commanders actually on the battle scene. They coordinated ground artillery and air attacks and moved against

all of Savimbi's positions at that point in time. There were a lot of casualties, including the loss of life by some of the Soviets themselves, and a number of exchanges occurred during that period of the last few weeks and the last few months.

As of right now, it appears that the Angolan Government troops have gotten the worst end of the whole deal. The point is that the Soviets have stepped up their presence, they have stepped up their pressure, they have stepped up their entire efforts, and they are indeed controlling and operating, for all practical purposes, the Government of Angola. And so the efforts the United States made a few years ago to try to get some accord and some accommodation and to get the Angolan Government to respond to some reasonable demands have basically gone for naught.

So we come to the point in time that we must look at what the American presence is and what our status is. What should we be doing with respect to the Government of Angola?

First of all, we have never recognized the current Government of Angola. It is not a formal recognition in any way. It has always been known to be a Communist government. One of the interesting ironies, though, is that despite the fact that we have never recognized them for the purposes of an embassy, we have not put them on the list to technically call them a Communist country, and since they are not legislatively labeled that and they are not labeled that by the State Department or the administration, they are eligible for Export-Import Bank loans. As a matter of fact, some of those loans are being processed, I am told, currently.

As a result of that processing, I have a great deal of concern and I think my colleagues have a great deal of concern because in the process of doing this, we are going to be providing loans to the Government of Angola, which is indeed a puppet of the Soviet Union, to carry out its wishes and to be able, in the process of these Export-Import Bank loans, to gain further United States investment that will accrue to the benefit of the Government in big ways and big dollars.

Now, what am I talking about? I am talking about the fact that every year, for several years now, the United States has imported more than \$1 billion worth of products from the country of Angola. Most of that importation has been oil. We buy better than 80 percent of all the oil that is produced by the country of Angola, and in a couple of years, maybe even this year, it will be almost 90 percent.

□ 1930

In the process of making these purchases, we are subsidizing that government which, in turn, actually pays

Castro's Cuban Government for the services of the 35,000 or 36,000 Cuban troops that are in that country under the command of Soviet commanders fighting against the freedom fighters of the Savimbi forces, fighting against the interests of the United States.

I find this to be absolutely indefensible. I find the U.S. position in regard to ignoring this fact to be immoral. And I believe it is time that my colleagues and I took some action to correct this matter. That is the reason for the legislation that was introduced today. That is the bottom-line reason.

We need to wake up to the fact that even though there is a debate focused, and I know a lot of attention is down there on the problems of apartheid in South Africa, a lot of concern, and rightfully so, has been had with Ethiopia and its drought and all the hunger that is there in the northern end, that from a political standpoint, from a standpoint of the question of the survival of the free world and the ideas of democracy versus the question of the supremacy of the Soviet Union and the Communists as a philosophy in this world, the battleground is in Angola and we are losing. Not only are we losing in Angola today, we are paying, financially supporting, and subsidizing the forces that are defeating us and defeating democracy. It is an absolutely twisted situation, as far as I can see.

Now there has been a proposal by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to provide humanitarian assistance to the Savimbi forces. He has a bill in to do exactly that. I think that in light of what is going on, it is a perfectly reasonable request that he is making of us to do that. If we are going to provide humanitarian assistance to the Contra's fighting the Communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua, I think that we have every good reason to also turn around and at least do that for the forces of Savimbi.

But until just a few months ago, just a few weeks ago actually in this body, we could not have been involved in any way at all. Only recently have we repealed what was passed in the 1970's known as the Clark amendment, which prohibited the United States from any participation in the Angolan situation on the side of any force, which was a ridiculous position for us to be in.

But now that we are clear of that Clark amendment and it has been repealed and we have the potential for this legislation to give humanitarian aid to Savimbi's forces, we ought to be doing that. In fact, we ought to seriously consider giving more than just simply humanitarian aid to Savimbi's forces, considering what the Soviets are doing in supplying the tanks, the weapons; not only that, but the man-

power and the direction of the war inside Angola.

But above all else, whether we provide the humanitarian aid or the military aid or anything else to the Savimbi forces and get involved directly, we do not have any business being involved in subsidizing this Communist regime in Angola and we do not have any business ignoring it in terms of our world concerns just because some very large major U.S. corporations have investments there and just because there is an American interest, of course economically in this, in terms of not having disruption or instability, we should not allow the basic principles of our Government to be spit upon and to be used to defeat the causes of democracy in that part of the world and to turn it to the Soviet advantage.

To me, it is an illogical position that we are forced into by the kind of logic some have told me since I first discussed introducing this legislation when they say, "Bill, you have no business getting involved in this. After all, economic sanctions aren't a good idea and you have always said that," and I always have.

I have up until this point basically felt that economic sanctions were not a very good tool of foreign policy for this Government, whether those were economic sanctions that we were using in Central America or whether they were in South Africa or whether they were against the Soviet Union. The primary reason for their not being a very good tool is that we do not get our allies to join in, and as a result of that, many times we do not have the pressures that we want to bring about to really make a difference in terms of the policy, so we do not get the changes and we only shoot ourselves in the foot.

In this particular case, though, where we have an ongoing civil war, where the U.S. dollars are indeed funding the enemy of our own Government and our own system and our own interests, I think that we have no other moral choice but to impose economic sanctions and to stop funding this kind of communism and this kind of overt Soviet activity.

Is Gorbachev using Angola to test the President, pending the summit meeting? I do not know.

Is he using Angola as an example to other African countries of the weakness of American foreign policy in the region? I think that is pretty clear.

Is he using the situation that is established now to slap us in the face because the United States was involved very successfully, diplomatically, in the winter of 1983-84 in getting an accord between South Africa and Angola on the withdrawal of troops and on an agreement that looked as though for a while it might bring about some stability in the region and

possibly minimize the Soviet influence in Angola and maybe bring about some kind of movement in the direction of more humanitarian concerns and more civil liberties in that country?

But the fact of the matter is that policy that we did succeed in just ever so briefly looks as though now that it was the prodding point, the key point that was raised to the Soviets and Gorbachev to remind them that they had in their hands the power to cut the U.S. interests, and they darn well better take advantage of it and not let us get any more of a foothold than we had.

So we are in this position today. We are in the position where the Soviets, without much notice on the part of the world, very little notice on the United States, stepped up their activities in 1984 and 1985 and in this summer and in this fall have actually been on the field, guiding the forces, guiding the 36,000 or so Cuban troops, guiding the 1,500 Soviet troops in the country, guiding the 2,500 or so East German troops in the country, directing the missiles, directing the tanks, directing the war against the freedom fighters of Savimbi and, really, as I said earlier, spitting in our face all the while as the primary cost of this war is being financed, not by the Soviet Union, but by the United States itself.

At any rate, it seems to me to be fairly ridiculous posture for us to be in and one that we need as rapidly as possible to get out of.

If we were to take the actions that I have proposed, we would end the Export-Import Bank loans that we are now making or undertaking. We would prohibit the investment in the future by any other U.S. companies of any other investments into Angola. We would not, however, divest anybody of their interest already there. They could sell their products somewhere else and certainly oil is a commodity that could be sold. I am sure the oil would be sold somewhere.

We would see, however, an end to future investment. We would end the possibility of any loans going into that country from our banks or other institutions that might decide for some reason or another to support either the private American investment or somebody else's investment in that country, and we would take a step that I think is long overdue, and that is, to bar the imports and, for that matter, the exports between the United States and Angola.

All at the same time in this bill, one little section that I think is really overdue in our concerns legislatively, would correct that deficiency that I noted earlier. We would amend section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include the People's Republic of Angola as a stated Communist gov-

ernment, which effectively bars them from a lot of other possible involvement with the United States, unless the President declares that it is in the national interest to make some special exception for that; but it is just so incredibly long overdue in terms of our recognition that they are part of the Soviet axis. They are a part of the Communist world. They are a part of the international Communist movement that is involved from Southeast Asia with the Soviets in Afghanistan and the Vietnamese in Cambodia to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas trying to influence and invade Honduras and Costa Rica and El Salvador, to the Cubans who are funneling the arms and being the conduit for a lot of that disruption in Central America, to Angola which is one of the clearest examples of all outside of Afghanistan which everyone knows about because the Soviets directly invaded it.

Angola, which is one of the clearest examples of all of the Soviet presence directly guiding the war, of the Cuban troops in large numbers who blatantly have been there for nearly 10 years and in the last year increased their number by about 10,000, to the actual affront of American interests like it has not been affronted anywhere else I know in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, my concerns are broad. I think that we needed an explanation of what this legislation was about, mainly because there is not enough time in 1 minute certainly to explain it, because not very many of the Members do concern themselves with the details of policy of a lesser-developed country in Africa like Angola, because the American public has not had much written about the subject and very little brought to its attention.

It occurs to me as I conclude these remarks this evening that unless there are lot of us who join together to bring more attention to this matter that it could very well be that this legislation, as so much else in this House, will go into a committee and not be heard from again and the war and the civil war activities guided by the Soviet Union against the Savimbi forces will continue, with the United States financing it, with the activities of human rights, tortures, continuing in Angola and so forth.

But I would hope that this legislation, combined with some of the media attention that columnists like Evans and Novak have brought to Angola recently and the concern that I think is now down at the White House on this issue, I would hope that we would raise up this profile before the American public, that we would see to it that the attention of this body does not simply dissipate into other areas and forget about it. That we would take affirmative action to demonstrate, not only our moral outrage, which is some-

thing we definitely should demonstrate in this case, our moral outrage at the long history of human rights violations and continued torture and continued violations of freedom of press and speech in the country of Angola, but that we would also demonstrate to the Soviet Union and to other countries in the world, importantly in Africa and lesser developed countries in our own hemisphere, that the United States is not going to be the fool anymore, the fool financing Communist revolutionary governments directed by the Soviet Union with on-ground commanders, that we are not going to be the fools to finance that anymore and that we are finally going to wake up and say, "No more," that we are going to come forward and make a statement that the world can see and can understand and perhaps give some credence to.

At any rate, I ask my colleagues' indulgence. As I said earlier, I have asked for the printing of the bill at the end of these remarks. I hope you read it and I would ask you to cosponsor it if you can and to come to this floor on other occasions when the opportunity presents itself and speak about Angola, learn about Angola, talk to your constituents and other Members and colleagues about the suppression of rights and the foolish policy of the United States in Angola.

Mr. Speaker, I include the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3598

A bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of oppression in Angola, to promote the development of democracy in Angola, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promotion of Democracy in Angola Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. POLICY DECLARATIONS.

The Congress finds and declares that—

- (1) it is the policy of the United States—
 - (A) to encourage all nations to adopt political, economic, and social policies which guarantee broad human rights, civil liberties, and individual economic opportunities; and
 - (B) to condemn oppression wherever it exists and to seek its eradication;
- (2) the people of Angola have been deprived of their fundamental human rights and denied civil liberties; and
- (3) the Government of Cuba has contributed to the deprivation of the Angolan people and is an obstacle to reconciliation in Angola.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON LOANS TO THE ANGOLAN GOVERNMENT.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—No United States person, or the Government of the United States, may make any loan or other extension of credit, directly or through a foreign affiliate of that United States person, to the Government of Angola or to any corporation, partnership, or other organization which is owned or controlled by the Govern-

ment of Angola, as determined under regulations which the President shall issue.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to a loan or extension of credit for which an agreement is entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—The President shall issue the regulations referred to in subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. RESTRICTIONS ON NEW INVESTMENTS.

(a) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall issue regulations prohibiting any United States person from making, directly or through a foreign affiliate of that United States person, any investment in Angola.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

- (1) a loan or extension of credit permitted under section 3;

- (2) an investment which consists of earnings derived from a business enterprise in Angola established before the date of the enactment of this Act and which is made in that business enterprise; and

- (3) the purchase, on a securities exchange registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, of securities in a business enterprise described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO ANGOLA.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370) is amended by inserting "People's Republic of Angola" after "People's Republic of Albania".

SEC. 6. IMPORTS FROM AND EXPORTS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ANGOLA.

(a) **IMPORTS.**—Goods and services from Angola may not be imported into the United States.

(b) **EXPORTS.**—Goods and services from the United States may not be exported, directly or indirectly, to or for the use by the Government of Angola.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply to international disaster relief and rehabilitation assistance provided under section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of this section, the term "United States" includes the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.

(a) **AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT.**—The President shall take the necessary steps to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act, including establishing mechanisms to monitor compliance with this Act. In ensuring such compliance, the President may conduct investigations, hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, take depositions, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matter under investigation.

(b) **PENALTIES.**—(1) Any person, other than an individual, that violates the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000.

(2) Any individual who violates the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than \$50,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) **ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.**—(1) Whenever a person commits a violation under subsection (b)—

(A) any officer, director, or employee of such person, or any natural person in control of such person who knowingly and willfully ordered, authorized, acquiesced in, or carried out the act or practice constituting the violation, and

(B) any agent of such person who knowingly and willfully carried out such act or practice,

shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(2) A fine imposed under paragraph (1) on an individual for an act or practice constituting a violation may not be paid, directly or indirectly, by the person committing the violation itself.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ACT.

The provisions of this Act shall terminate if the President certifies to the Congress that Angola—

(1) is making a concerted and significant effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights;

(2) has entered into discussions with its non-communist opposition;

(3) has established a body of laws that assures the full national participation of all the people of Angola in the social, political, and economic life in that country;

(4) has held free and fair elections not later than November 11, 1986; and

(5) all troops from Cuba, the Soviet Union, and any other Communist country have withdrawn from Angola.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Angola" refers to the territory that constituted the People's Republic of Angola on November 11, 1975, and is represented by the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party;

(2) the term "branch" means the operations or activities conducted by a person in a different location in its own name rather than through a separate incorporated entity;

(3) the term "business enterprise" means any organization, association, branch, or venture which exists for profitmaking purposes or to otherwise secure economic advantage;

(4) the term "foreign affiliate" of a United States person is a business enterprise located in a foreign country, including a branch, which is controlled by that United States person.

(5) the term "investment in Angola" means establishing, or otherwise investing funds or other assets in, a business enterprise in Angola, including making a loan or other extension of credit to such a business enterprise;

(6) the term "United States person" means any United States resident or national and any domestic concern (including any permanent domestic establishment of any foreign concern);

(7) A United States person shall be presumed to control a business enterprise if—

(A) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (directly or indirectly) more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities of the business enterprise;

(B) the United States person beneficially owns or controls (directly or indirectly) 25 percent or more of the voting securities of the business enterprise, if no other person owns or controls (directly or indirectly) an equal or larger percentage;

(C) the business enterprise is operated by the United States person pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(D) a majority of the members of the board of directors of the business enterprise are also members of the comparable governing body of the business enterprise of the United States person; or

(E) the United States person has authority to appoint the chief operation officer of the business enterprise.

THE LESSONS OF GRENADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JOE BARTON. What we would like to do tonight is talk about the lessons of Grenada. You will recall just 2 years ago Grenada was in the news. I think Americans have a picture of American troops on the island. They have a picture and perhaps remember American students coming back to the United States and kissing the soil and remember all the arguments, the outrage and outcries from the Soviet bloc at the time, perhaps remember the arguments against our action in Grenada; remember those arguments that Grenada was a state which was just a popular democratic government, independent, nonaligned, had popular support, and that we should not be messing around down there. Those were the arguments given against the action that our President took.

Well, now it is 2 years later. This week by action of our body is "Lessons of Grenada Week."

This House, with support from both parties, passed a resolution the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 20, 1985, as "The Lessons of Grenada Week," and urge the Governors of the several States and the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I think it is entirely appropriate and important that we do look at the lessons of Grenada and that is what Congressman BARTON and I will try to do tonight and look at some of the arguments that were made back then and see whether those arguments stand up and which ones.

It is amazing to me that very little has been written, comparatively speaking, about Grenada. I suspect this may be because the U.S. operation had the appearance of success and in this country we like to dwell on failures. Maybe that is why the news media, except for the brief flurry at the time of the invasion, has largely ignored this issue. Maybe that is why academics have not rushed to write about it; but this past year there appeared a fascinating document called "Grenada Documents, an Overview and Selec-

tion," put out by the Department of Defense and the Department of State.

□ 1945

These documents are selected from 35,000 pounds of documents that were seized after the liberation of Grenada. One would think, with the publication of these documents, that there would be enormous coverage in the news media, that academics on all of the campuses would be rushing to write about what was uncovered, but as I say, very little has been written.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman, being a former member of the media, having a distinguished career in the State of Washington in the video broadcasting industry, might have an idea as to why there has not been more coverage of the information that the gentleman just referred to. Could the gentleman enlighten me on that point?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. The gentleman will remember that at the time of the invasion, the news media was very concerned about why they were not allowed to go with the first wave, but once that concern had subsided, and once the American troops had gone in and gone out, there has been, as I said, very little coverage.

The only conclusion I can come to explain this is that the American news media is very interested in understanding what goes wrong, as they should be; what goes wrong when our Government undertakes an operation. But there is not as much interest in looking at an operation that may have been successful.

The other reason may be that, if you look at these 35,000 pounds of documents, of which this is just a sample, it is hard going and there is nothing glamorous about sending a reporter to go into the archives and look at the minutes of the Politburo meetings of the Leninist Party of Grenada, to look at the minutes of the Central Committee meetings, to look at the memorandums the Grenadian Ambassador in Moscow sent back to his country, to look at the Prime Minister of Grenada's speeches, to look at the memos sent by the wife of the Cuban Ambassador to Grenada instructing the Grenadian Prime Minister on how to deal with the American Congress and the American news media. There is nothing really sexy or jazzy in poring over these documents. This is not what one would call a visual event. It is hard for television and radio to visualize this.

But the newspapers, I would have to say, have not done much better either. As I say, I guess this is not one of the assignments that reporters yearn for. But I think it is so important that we look at what went on in Grenada because, and I think this will come out, Congressman BARTON, as we further discuss this, what we have here is a lesson in how Leninism operates, how it operates in a small country, how it can operate not only without popular support but in defiance of popular support, how it operates connected with the Soviet Union in Cuba, and how it operates against the interests of free people, those who are free throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield any time the gentleman from Texas wants to comment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman would yield, I have a few comments I would like to make before we get into our dialog.

Mr. Speaker, Grenada was invaded on October 25, 1983. On October 26, 1983, I happened to be in our Nation's Capital. I was trying to make up my mind whether I wanted to make an attempt to become a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I had scheduled a list of appointments with some of the Congressmen from the State of Texas who were members of the Republican Party to discuss with them my qualifications and whether or not they felt it would be appropriate for me to try to join them as a colleague.

That was the day after the Grenadian invasion and I was struck, during that day, as I went around from congressional office to congressional office by the sense of pride that all of the Members of Congress that I spoke with, Congressman BILL ARCHER, Congressman JACK FIELDS, Congressman PHIL GRAMM, Congressman STEVEN BARTLETT, the sense of the pride that they had in being an American and the total support they had for President Reagan for making the decision to go in and offer such assistance as was necessary to liberate Grenada from Communist subjugation.

That helped me to make up my mind to seek membership in this great body, and there are some lessons from Grenada. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, has led the fight to have this week of October 20 to October 25, declared "Lessons of Grenada Week," and I am sure the gentleman knows how difficult it is to get the type of support that is necessary to get this kind of a resolution passed. He had to get 218 Members of both Democratic and Republican Party affiliations to sign their names that they felt that this was an important event and needed to be honored, celebrated, publicized, by having a week, and he was able to accomplish that.

So this is not an idle exercise in rhetoric. We feel, I feel, you feel, at least 218 Members of this body feel that it is important that the American people know that freedom has a price and we can point to an example near our shores where that freedom was almost taken away, and only because we were able to act and to free the Grenadians were we able to discover the depth to which the totalitarian regime of that country had fallen.

But one of the lessons of Grenada, in my opinion, is that the Communist Party has not changed. They still want world domination, and these 35,000 pounds of documents that the gentleman referred to earlier in his remarks are there for the press to look at, for the world to look at, to see the type of deceit that was going on vis-a-vis the Grenadian population and the world population at large with respect to what the Grenadian Government in existence at that time was up to.

There is no doubt if one takes the time, as the gentleman has and as I have and as other colleagues have to review even partially those documents, that Grenada was the second step. Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua were all part of a master plan. We have foiled the plan in Grenada. There are freedom fighters actually in Nicaragua, which I support and many of my colleagues support, and we need to remain vigilant because communism still has, as its A priority, No. 1 priority, world domination and we have to work daily to see that that does not happen.

During this week we will be debating and going through various points to highlight that. Today is "National Debate Day." Thursday is "National Memorial Day." Friday is going to be a day of celebration for the freedom that Grenada now has, and there will be rallies here in Washington and around the country to celebrate that freedom.

□ 1955

So I am here to discuss with you the various lessons of Grenada.

But the No. 1 lesson that we cannot forget is that communism still has as its first priority world domination. I will be happy to yield back to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his comments. I recall, as he does, that time 2 years ago, and the tremendous pride that was felt at the time of the Grenada landing. I did not realize that it played a crucial part in the gentleman's decision to join this body. I am delighted to hear that.

Just picking up where the gentleman left off, one of the things that comes home to me when I look at some of these documents is the picture of Leninism at work in a small country. This is an island in the Caribbean

of 110,000 people. If you look at the minutes of the Central Committee meetings, political bureau meetings, notes of the Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop, you get this picture of a very small, dedicated group of people imposing their will on a nation.

The number of people that helped take over the government, the armed coup was 40, 40 people. And once they get control, the first step, as the Prime Minister Bishop outlined in his speech to his party colleagues, which is one of the main documents in this volume called "Line of March For the Party," in the first speech, the first step as Prime Minister Bishop pointed out as soon as control was seized by armed forces was to call the so-called bourgeois elements in the country, democratic forces, religious groups, business groups, and to assure them that really there would be a pluralist society, there would be a place for them. And as Prime Minister Bishop explained to his comrades, this was necessary in order to lull these other elements of society into believing that this was not a true Leninist revolution. So this was the first step.

Then after taking that step, after bringing some other elements into the Government, but always making sure that the crucial decisionmaking bodies were controlled by Leninist forces, then gradually to edge these groups out. At first, to maintain civil liberties so as not to arouse suspicion, and once the consolidation of power, to slowly start putting political opponents in jail, to clamp down on the newspapers and the opposition press. Even with the economy, as the Prime Minister very candidly told his so-called comrades, "We have to move slowly. We must build, of course, State socialism. We cannot do it overnight."

So we leave the private sector, large parts of the private economy intact. The State takes over only certain portions of the country and the economy. But the goal in 5 or 10 years, of course, is to have total State control.

The whole attempt to make sure that different elements of society were watched and observed, you see reports in here describing different parishes in the country and describing by name people that were considered dangerous or "very dangerous." This type of spying soon started taking place.

Now, to do this, of course, this small elite group had to develop additional membership.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman from Washington have any information as to what happened to some of those people who were identified as dangerous people? Were they enabled to go about their business as usual? Were they imprisoned? Did they disappear and were their whereabouts unknown?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Some were allowed to go about their business as usual. Some ended up in prison. Some were released after the liberation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. When the gentleman says liberation, what is he referring to?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I am talking about when American troops invaded Grenada. Some ended up being shot, mainly at the end of the regime's rule. This was a group that knew how to take power and keep it and, of course, one of the primary goals, as soon as power was taken, was educating of different cadre, the setting up of party schools to expound on Leninist principles, the sending of people to Cuba and the Soviet Union, the bringing of Soviet and Cuban advisers into the country to help with this educational process. So the Prime Minister, who was very candid about this, said "So that our young people can learn Leninist principles." And you see all of the clichés here if you read these documents: dictatorship of the proletariat, the party is the vanguard of the revolution, the importance of avoiding right and left opportunism, the importance of adhering to Leninist principles, even down to organizing in this Caribbean island mass celebrations of Lenin's birthday. I mean, this is how far, this is how far it went.

And of course, the attempts to first co-op and then to infiltrate potential opponent groups. It is hard to fathom, hard to believe on this peaceful Caribbean island it could go on. You see the lengthy memos on how to infiltrate, to woo, to win over, to co-op religious groups as a major project of the regime. Also how to infiltrate business groups and a constant effort by this small group to consolidate control. And of course, not only do you see Leninism at work in the island, but you see it at work when you read some of these documents. You see it at work abroad because, as you just mentioned, you have the Soviet and Cuban advisers coming in and out, and you have this conscious effort by this small nation to develop ties with Cuba and the Soviet Union, not to talk much about it. As the Prime Minister points out, "We cannot be too public," on a lot of these agreements. In fact, some of the documents are actually signed agreements between the Soviet Union and Grenada, between Cuba and Grenada, between North Korea and Grenada, and between North Vietnam and Grenada.

But always the reference to secrecy, to keep this secret, so it would not alarm Grenada's neighbors, and so not to alarm the United States.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield on that. Is there not a secret document, or at least it was secret at the time, the secret mutual

defense treaty between the Grenadians and the Soviet Union that only became public after we liberated the country? Is that not one of the documents?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. The gentleman is correct. There are two agreements. One is the top-secret agreement between Grenada and the U.S.S.R., and that is the title of it, 1980. The second was the top-secret agreement between Grenada and the U.S.S.R., 1982.

I would not call it a mutual defense agreement. The Soviet Union was very careful not to obligate itself to come to the defense of their comrades in Grenada. But what they did provide in these agreements was a massive quantity of arms.

Here is this nation of 110,000, you have in these agreements 2,000 submachineguns coming in, 6,000 uniforms, tremendous quantities of arms as a part of this process of building up Soviet and Cuban ties.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I seem to recall photos immediately after the country was liberated of several warehouses chock full of automatic weapons and ammunition and small arms, far in excess of any legitimate defense needs of the country of Grenada. One could only assume that they were there to be exported to other countries in Central and South America, or to be used in uprising or to create some massive army on the island of Grenada itself that could be used for nondefense purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I am glad the gentleman from Texas raises that point, because as part of this Leninist approach, as part of the ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba, you see reading these documents the setting in motion of an attempt to export revolution. The gentleman mentions the caches of arms, and he will recall at the time of the liberation some said, "Well, so there are arms on Grenada, they are not modern missiles," and they are not. The point is they were weapons far in excess of what that government needed to control the country of Grenada.

Just to give one example, it did not arrive, but one of the top-secret agreements provides for the Soviet Union to send an airplane via Cuba to Grenada. The airplane was designed to hold 19 paratroopers that could be dropped anywhere.

Now the Leninist government of Grenada did not need an airplane to drop 19 paratroopers on Grenada, you can be sure of that. Here you have these other islands surrounding Grenada, many of which have no armies and, of course, none of them have sources coming anywhere near to what Grenada was building up. So you look at all of these arms coming in, you look at that plane designed to drop

paratroopers, you read the minutes and you see the importance given to, as they say, preserving fraternal solidarity with their comrades in Nicaragua and El Salvador and the Soviet Union. You see the reference to the importance of Grenada assuming a regional role and supporting revolutions elsewhere, and there is not the slightest doubt when you read these documents to know that the ultimate aim, once the consolidation had been achieved on Grenada, was to start doing some island-hopping.

One of the parts that was particularly interesting to me, if the gentleman from Texas will permit me to just continue, the Grenadian Ambassador to the Soviet Union had many conferences with the Soviet military, and one of those conferences was with Marshal Ogarkov, the Soviet Chief of Staff. The Grenadian Ambassador reported back on those meetings, and in one of his reports, he tells his comrades in Grenada, "The Marshal said that over two decades ago there was only Cuba in Latin America. Today there are Nicaragua, Grenada, and a serious battle is going on in El Salvador."

This was the context of the Soviet military aid to Grenada. This was the context of all of the liaisons and conferences between Soviet military personnel and Grenadian military personnel. This was the background, the backdrop that we have to understand when we hear and read of numerous Grenadian soldiers being sent to Cuba and the Soviet Union and other places for training.

So I think the gentleman from Texas makes an excellent point when he talks about one of the lessons of Grenada being that when you have a Leninist regime, when you have a regime with ties to the Soviet Union and Cuba, you do not have to guess about what is going to come next. Next is going to be an attempt to subvert neighbors of the regime. Next is going to be an attempt to export violent revolution.

As I reflect on what some of these lessons are, and we do not have time this evening to go into all of these documents, but I should point out that if somebody wishes to get a copy, they were published last year by the Department of State and the Department of Defense. These are no longer classified. These can be acquired from your U.S. Government. If somebody is interested, they can write to the State Department or the Defense Department, and I am sure they would, I hope they would get a prompt answer.

□ 2010

I think back: Well, what are the lessons of Grenada? I think the first lesson is that we should be skeptical about some of the arguments we hear

when there is a regime with ties to the Soviet Union; a new government that is trying to make overtures to the Soviet Union.

I think back to those arguments. As I mentioned in the beginning, the arguments we heard against the President's action, you know: "It's not a real Leninist regime." Well, we know that it was a real Leninist regime, that the argument that it was no threat to its neighbors; well, we know it was a threat to its neighbors.

The argument that it really had popular support; some popular support. Took power with 40 people participating in coup. After the invasion, a poll on the island showed 90 percent of the people favored the invasion, and then elections were held the following year, the successor of the Leninist party in Grenada got 5 percent of the vote.

Yet, there were magazines in this country saying, "Well, this may be a bad government, but the people really like it." Of course, they did not, and when they had a chance to choose another way, they did choose another way. So I think that is a lesson.

Now I do not mean by that that we should automatically be opposed to any revolution. There is enough repression and injustice in this world that I would have to say that there can be and there are some revolutions that are not Communist inspired, that are not Communist controlled. We have to make judgments.

When a revolution takes place, and the leaders start spouting Leninist clichés, when a revolution takes place and the leaders start making trips to Cuba and the Soviet Union, when a revolution takes place and the leaders start bringing in Soviet arms and Cuban arms and advisers, then we better watch out.

I think another lesson of these documents and a lesson of Grenada is a very healthy respect for the power and effectiveness of Leninism at work. We cannot underestimate Leninism. It is very easy to say well, this is a poor Caribbean country—what do such people know about Leninism? These cannot be real Leninists.

Yet we see how a small group of people with proper training for the most part in Cuba and the Soviet Union were able to impose their will on 110,000 people; and not only that, from 1979 when they took over until 1983, for 4 years they ruled Grenada. Despite the fact that only 5 percent may have supported them; they were able to keep control.

If it had not been for the invasion and liberation, we have to ask ourselves, "Where would Grenada be today?" So one of the lessons to me is, "Do not underestimate Leninism at work even when it is in the Third World."

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman would yield on that point, if the gentleman from Washington would come with me to my district down in Texas, and we went out on the street and polled 10 people and said, "What do you think of Leninism?" We would probably get eight or nine people that did not know what Leninism was.

If the gentleman would go with me and poll 10 people and say, "What do you think of communism?" I think we would get 10 people in short order who would very emphatically say that communism was bad news.

I feel that perhaps one of the problems and the reason that the Communists took control too easily and rapidly in Grenada was because they cloaked their action in phrases like Leninism and proletariat of the people, and did not actually admit that they were Communist and that their goals were totalitarian domination of the people; and in this body we have a proclivity for speaking in high-blown phrases when sometimes we would be much better off if we would get right to the heart of the matter and call a Communist a Communist; a totalitarian a totalitarian.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] makes an excellent point. Of course the Grenadian leadership; occasionally they slipped up and used the word "Communist"; you see it in these documents; but they avoided that word. They avoided that word because of course in the Communist ideology a country like Grenada where there had just been a seizure of power was not considered Communist yet. The complete consolidation of power had not taken place; the whole economy had not been seized. Every civil liberty had not been repressed, so they were reluctant to call themselves Communists.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In public.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Yes. They preferred the term "Marxist-Leninist," and of course actually I think in looking at it we ought to underline Leninist, because all these concepts of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party is the vanguard, the whole concept of suppressing the opposition of course derived primarily from Lenin, not from Marx.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] does make a good point. I think in our country there is a need of course to learn about our own democracy, our own history, but looking at what has gone on in the world in the last 50 years, looking at the struggles we are now involved in, I think it is important that we learn about communism. It is important that we learn about Leninism; it is important that we learn about Marxism. It is important, getting back to the gentleman's point, it is important that we learn

how these words are manipulated and maneuvered; very important.

I just wish that some of our colleagues would have some more courses on Marxist-Leninism and communism, but particularly in how it works in Third World countries, how it works in nations like Grenada.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield one more time.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the graciousness of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Speaking of colleges has brought to mind one of the events that is transpiring in the Lessons of Grenada Week, and that is seminars and policy discussions on our Nation's college campuses. I have a list here of over 100 college campuses that are going to be holding some sort of a seminar or discussion of the lessons of Grenada. Time does not permit that I go through all of the list.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I was just going to suggest, I am so delighted to hear that, I was going to suggest that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] read some of the groups and colleges. This may inspire others who are not participating to hold sessions or meetings.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would be more than happy to. The University of Akron; University of Arkansas; University of Auburn; Baylor University in my State; Bowling Green; Central Florida; University of Cincinnati; Clemson University; Colorado State; the University of Colorado at Boulder; Dallas Baptist University; Dalton College in Georgia; Dartmouth College; University of Denver; Duke University; University of Florida; Florida State; George Washington University here in the Nation's Capital; Georgia State; Harding College in Arizona; Illinois State University; Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, MD; University of Kentucky; University of Maryland; University of Missouri; University of Michigan; University of North Carolina; North Carolina at Wilmington; Northwestern University; Ohio State; Oklahoma State; Portland State in Oregon which is close to your home State of Washington; Purdue University where I went to graduate school—

Mr. MILLER of Washington. All of these colleges are holding meetings or classes on Lessons of Grenada Week?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. To date, this is a somewhat dated list, but there are over 200 universities on this list, and we expect that an additional 200 to 300 will hold some kind of an event this week.

So there are universities throughout the length and breadth of our great Nation that have felt that it is important to expose to their college students some of these lessons which you

and I have been talking about this evening.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. That reminds me of an incident that took place a couple of days ago and I think drives home the point that the gentleman from Texas and I are trying to make about the need to increase our knowledge of communism and Marxist Leninism.

□ 2020

You will recall a few days ago the Nicaraguan leader, Daniel Ortega, announced that Nicaragua was going to be suspending various civil liberties and civil rights. That morning I read an article in the Washington Post, and it reported what had happened, and then it got to the interpretation part of the article, and it offered various reasons for why this might be the case, why the Nicaraguan Government was taking this action.

I heard a radio news report, a Mutual News network report, along the same lines. But with all the explanations that Mutual News gave or the Washington Post gave as to why Ortega or the Nicaraguan Government was taking these actions, the one explanation they did not give, and that explanation was: Maybe this is a Marxist-Leninist government that is just following the Leninist road. Maybe this suppression of civil liberties is because it has been planned all along. Instead, there were all sorts of interpretations that, "Well, maybe the war against the Contras was not going well," or, "Maybe they were upset with the United States, maybe the church has upset them."

But nowhere did one of these, at least these two news media outlets, say, "Well, you know, this is the way a Marxist-Leninist government operates after it starts to consolidate power. It slowly starts to take away liberties."

So that tells me that it is not just on the college campuses of this country that we need more knowledge of what goes on in places like Grenada.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, there are other organizations in this country that this week have agreed to participate in the lessons of Grenada Week.

I will read again not totally but just some: United States Jaycee's, Lions International, Moral Majority, National Association of Evangelicals, American Coalition for Traditional Values, Campus Crusade for Christ, Freedom Council, Council for Inter-American Security, American Conservative Union, Citizens for Reagan, Free the Eagle, Young Americans, College Republicans, Young Conservative Alliance, Students for America, Young Social Democrats, Coalition for Democracy in Central America, National Center for Public Policy Research, U.S.A. Foundation, Conservative Youth Foundation. Those are just a

few of the organizations that feel it is important to get the message out.

Citizens for Reagan has a bumper sticker, and I am sure the gentleman has seen some of these on cars in his district, I have seen them down in Texas: "Grenada Liberation Day October 25, 1985, Two Years of Freedom." That is just one example of the type of things and events and publicity that we are trying to give this week.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. Hopefully there will be another volume of these documents out shortly, and I hope that this week we will at least in some small way focus not only on the joy and exultation we felt at the success of the Grenada operation but also the lessons of Grenada. And when the gentleman from Texas reads about all these events I am just delighted. I hope that it will continue next year. I hope more scholars will start poring over these documents, more students will start reading them, more members of the news media will start having them as background material, because I think if we all focus more on what happened in Grenada and take advantage of the materials that are available to us, I think we will be better prepared to protect the liberties and freedoms that we so very much cherish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. I thank the Speaker for his attention.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GRAMM-RUDMAN-MACK AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the Speaker for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, I promise I will not take the entire 60 minutes.

I would like to speak this evening on an item of utmost importance not only to the present of this country but to the future of our great country, and that is the conference committee that is now in progress between the House of Representatives and the other body of Congress with regard to agreeing to or disagreeing to the Senate resolution with regard to the Deficit Reduction

Act and raising the debt ceiling to over \$2 trillion.

The conference committee is meeting today. It has to finish its work by November 1, which is the date that the money literally runs out. If we cannot reach agreement with the other body between now and November 1, we will run out of money, we will have to shut the Government down, and that will have negative consequences that no one wants.

The legislation that is under consideration is commonly referred to as the Gramm-Rudman-Mack bill. I have the bill with me, House Joint Resolution 372. I will be referring to that this evening in my remarks.

I was able to earlier, in a special order that Congressman FRANK of Massachusetts held on the same subject, to enter into a very limited dialog, a very limited debate about just what this bill does.

I would like to enlarge upon that, and I would like to begin by referring to a cartoon that my colleague from New Hampshire, "BOB" SMITH, showed me this afternoon on the House floor. It showed a nursery of children singing a song, and the song they were singing was, "We Owe the World, We Are the Children."

That is very, very true. We are literally mortgaging our country's future today to provide benefits today that we are not able to pay for.

Mr. Speaker, I have three children; I have a son, 15, named Bradley, a daughter, 10, named Alison, and a daughter, 3, named Kristin. They already owe, whether we borrow 1 penny more, they already owe somewhere between \$50,000 and \$250,000 to pay off the current national debt.

I do not want to saddle them with a liability, a financial liability that they literally cannot pay. For this reason I feel that the Gramm-Rudman-Mack bill needs to be passed. This Congress, this body, within the next 2 weeks needs to pass this legislation. Contrary to what some Members have spoken of in this body this evening, Gramm-Rudman-Mack is not going to eliminate poverty programs, it is not going to cause our poor to become poorer, our hungry to go without food.

In fact, the bill very specifically states that no program may be eliminated through this budget resolution process.

What it does state very specifically and succinctly is that each year we are going to have a deficit target and the deficit target for next fiscal year is \$180 billion. That target declines by \$30 billion each year until it reaches zero in fiscal year 1991.

I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I share the gentleman's support for the concept of Gramm-Rudman-Mack, and I

was particularly interested by his reference to programs that help the poor, because the gentleman will recall, just a short while ago in these Chambers we heard tremendous concern expressed about the poor, those that were hungry or homeless, sincere concerns, genuine concerns. I could not help thinking as I listened to these comments that it is so important to understand that when we talk about reducing the deficit, when we talk about adopting a framework such as Gramm-Rudman-Mack, we are talking about doing something that will help not just the wealthy, not just the middle class—though, yes, it will help them and should—but it will help the poor. Who is going to suffer? Who is going to be hurt the most if we do not bring this deficit under control? Who is going to be hurt the most if, 5 or 10 years from now, that interest on the national debt keeps rising every year so that 50 percent of our Federal budget then will have to go just to pay the interest on the national debt? What is going to happen then? Either massive cuts in spending that will make anything we are talking about now seem piddling or massive tax increases, and who is going to be hurt then, 5, 10, 15 years down the road when that deficit comes home and those incredible tax hikes and incredible spending slashes take place?

Now, this country is no longer a land of opportunity but a land of misery. Are not the poor going to be the ones that will suffer just as much or more than anybody else?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would suggest to my colleague from Washington that the poor would suffer, senior citizens would suffer, my children would suffer, your children would suffer. We would all suffer.

I think we would subject our great Nation to a situation similar to that which occurred in the Weimar Republic in Germany immediately after World War I in which spending got out of control and hyperinflation resulted and which eventually led to the downfall of democracy in that country and the institution of nazism.

I am not suggesting that that would occur in that particular form in this country, but I think our society would be put under such tremendous strains that it would require changes the like of which we have no way of knowing the ultimate outcome.

What upsets me is that it does not have to be. Gramm-Rudman-Mack has a mechanism that shares the cuts that are going to have to be made, proportionately across the board. It exempts no programs except for Social Security. Social Security is exempted because of the simple fact that it has its own dedicated trust fund. No other program in our Government at the Federal level has that.

Gramm-Rudman requires that the President submit a budget at the beginning of the budget cycle that is within the deficit targets. Under today's Budget Act of 1974, the President does not have to do that.

So the President has to set out his spending priorities within these targets, submit them to the Congress, and the Congress acts on those targets.

□ 2035

If the Congress disagrees with spending priorities, the Congress is free to change those priorities, so long as every place it increases a program it makes a corresponding decrease in another program so that the ultimate result is a total budget that is within the budget deficit ceiling, which like I said earlier, is \$180 billion for fiscal year 1986 and then declines by \$36 billion each year until fiscal year 1991.

Now the point has been raised that defense would not accept proportional cuts. In my reading of the bill, that is not true. The cuts are proportional across the board. To the extent that the spending exceeds the deficit, half of the cuts have to come out of discretionary spending in every category and half of the cuts have to come out of automatic COLA increases. That does not tell me that defense is going to be spared and the social programs are going to be hit too heavily. It tells me that it will be across the board.

The point has been made that the President could veto the budget reconciliation bill.

No. 1, if the President vetoed the budget reconciliation bill, the Congress can override that veto. No. 2, if the President and the Congress act responsibly in the beginning, there is no reason for the President to veto in the first place.

If you look back on the lack of spending restraint that prior Congresses have shown, you will see that we have not had a balanced budget in this Congress since I believe fiscal year 1969 or 1970.

This Nation was founded in the late 1700's. We had our Constitution enacted in 1787, I believe. It took over 200 years to get the first trillion dollars added to our national deficit. In 1979, we reached a trillion dollars in the national deficit. It only took 6 years, in 1985, to reach \$2 trillion—1986, maybe 7 years, to reach \$2 trillion.

So it took 200 years for the first trillion, it has taken 6 or 7 years for the second trillion; if we do not enact something like Gramm-Rudman-Mack, it will only take 2 or 3 years for the next trillion, and then a year for the next trillion. Where will it end?

I will point out to my colleague from Washington that our total gross national product in the United States of America, which is the largest economy

in the world, is somewhere between \$4 trillion and \$4.5 trillion a year. Now we already have a national debt that is going to exceed \$2 trillion. We have interest on that debt approaching \$150 billion. It is the fastest growing part of the Federal budget. The interest on the national debt is the fastest growing part of the Federal budget. Last year it grew at the rate of \$13 billion a year.

Now when our distinguished colleagues of this body come before us and talk about the need for programs, whether they be in the defense area or social services area, whatever, I would point out that if we could spend an additional \$13 billion on poverty in this country, we could do a lot. But we cannot because we have to pay that to pay the increase in the national debt. If we cannot get spending under control, we will not be able to institute any new programs of any kind. All additional revenues will go to the voracious increase in interest on the national debt.

Now, I support Gramm-Rudman-Mack because it is an alternative. It is a program. It is implementable. It will work.

My colleagues that have pointed out some of the potential flaws in this program have not come up with an alternative.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. It is ironic that those who criticize Gramm-Rudman-Mack do not offer a framework of their own for bringing us down to zero deficit, is it not?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It is ironic.

I would also think it is somewhat ironic that less than 2 weeks ago in this very Chamber we passed a motion to instruct to the House conferees on the Gramm-Rudman-Mack bill that instructed them to support the principle embodied in Gramm-Rudman as it passed the other body. And some of those very same Members have been on this floor today beginning to talk against it. They voted for it less than 2 weeks ago, and now they are out working to torpedo that very motion to instruct that they were so much for less than 2 weeks ago.

Sadly, many of those Members are members of the majority party, the Democratic Party, which has a proud tradition in our country's history of trying to help people. I would hope that the majority of the Democratic Party would support the conferees in the motion to instruct and pass Gramm-Rudman or something very similar to it so that we can get spending under control. If we cannot do it now, when can we do it?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I just came down because I heard the gentleman was talking about Gramm-Rudman, and I was sitting in my office reading the morning Atlanta Constitution, my local newspaper in Atlanta. I noticed that on the second page there was a story about a number of our Democratic colleagues who had come to Georgia State University in Atlanta to talk about basically why the Democratic Party had failed to lure the younger vote.

One of our colleagues made the statement at this particular forum that it was basically the Reagan administration that had accumulated this deficit, an unprecedented deficit.

And as I read that, first of all it struck me that certainly that is a very naive statement to say that any one man is capable of amassing a deficit of the magnitude that we speak about when we say \$2 trillion.

But second, it occurred to me that if, in fact, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are as aggrieved by the magnitude of this deficit as they state they are, then certainly they should be here with us tonight and every opportunity that they have to talk about at least the concept of Gramm-Rudman, because at this point it is of no value whatsoever to continue to try to place the blame on the President, on the Senate, on the House or anybody. The point is we have got to start trying to find the solution.

As I start thinking about the problem, I am reminded of a family that lives in northwest Atlanta, or did up until just several years ago, who inherited a very large and spacious mansion, a beautiful mansion that had been in the family for years and years. They moved into this mansion.

After staying there for about a year and a half, they began to recognize that no matter how much they cut their expenditures, no matter how much they tried to increase their own earnings, they simply could not make ends meet. And they worked and they worked and they worked, and they became slaves to this mansion trying to keep it up.

Finally, they all gathered together, the family did, and said, "You know, we were really a lot happier before we got this mansion, because we have become slaves to this structure. And the truth of the matter is that no matter how hard we labor and no matter how many fundamental decisions we make in terms of cutting our living expenditures and whatever, we simply cannot afford this mansion."

Then they made one of the wisest decisions of their lives. They sold the mansion and moved into a structure that they could afford. Since then their lives have been substantially happier.

In so many ways, I think that is exactly what we have done in this country. We have constructed this structure that literally makes it impossible for us to maintain. We cannot maintain this structure that the last 30 years of social policies have created. And the truth of the matter is that until we recognize that, we cannot revenue our way out of it and we cannot cut our way out of it; we have to attack the structure itself.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I could not agree more with my colleague from Georgia.

There is a comic strip character named Pogo, and Pogo makes a statement at some point in the comic strip that we have met the enemy and he is us.

And the enemy is us. The Members of this body have voted for one program after the other over the years because our way of compromising instead of making a choice between this program and that program, we chose to fund both programs.

□ 2045

And when there were decisions as to how much to fund, we chose the higher level, and we have promised too much to, too many for too long. We have got to begin to prioritize and to make some decisions about how to spend the scarce Federal resources that are at our disposal. Gramm-Rudman-Mack does this, and it does it across the board. It very specifically states that no one program can go below zero. It very specifically states that all of the cuts have to be proportional, and no cuts occur, as far as automatic cuts, unless Congress does not meet these deficit targets.

I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I am listening to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Georgia, and I am struck by the critics of Gramm-Rudman-Mack. Some of them say it goes too far, and some of them say it does not go far enough. We heard earlier on the House floor those who felt it went too far, that it picked on social programs, it would hurt the poor. I think, as the gentleman from Texas has ably explained, it does not pick on anybody, it tries for an across-the-board approach. Obviously, it has to be an across-the-board approach if we are going to make a dent in this deficit. But then there are other critics who say, well, Gramm-Rudman does too little; after all, if you had the will to make these cuts, we would not need Gramm-Rudman, and Gramm-Rudman does not make the cuts and it does not require Congress to do it.

Of course, there is a grain of truth in that. Gramm-Rudman is a framework, and Congress does not have to follow it. But when you look at how Congress has failed to make the reduc-

tions, one has to conclude that a framework at least offers some hope. If we can get the framework, maybe we will get the cuts. Even better, if we can get a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution, that will make sure that we get the cuts.

I think Gramm-Rudman-Mack offers hope, and the balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution offers to make that hope a reality. I hope that the Speaker of this body will allow us to vote on both proposals, because I think a combination of the framework and the constitutional amendment, the framework of Gramm-Rudman-Mack and the balanced-budget constitutional amendment, that combination will finally bring this body to make the decisions that it has been unable to make.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The gentleman from Washington makes an excellent point. I could not agree more with him. I would point out that the Gramm-Rudman-Mack bill is a temporary bill, it is a 5-year bill. It expires in fiscal year 1991. That gives us time to pass the balanced-budget amendment. Congressman LARRY CRAIG of Idaho has got such an amendment. He expects very shortly to have 218 cosponsors. If those 218 cosponsors will sign a discharge petition, we will get the vote on his balanced-budget amendment in this Congress, and I hope we do.

If we combine 5-year emergency reduction act embodied in Gramm-Rudman with the balanced-budget amendment, as the gentleman from Washington talked of, we can get a handle on Federal spending. And once we get a handle on Federal spending, then we can begin to make these priority decisions, and then we may begin to fund some of these new programs, to have additional funding for some of the programs that many Members of this body feel so devoted to, but only if we get a handle on spending right now. And right now, spending is out of control. This body has shown itself incapable of showing any kind of financial discipline. It has just piled spending on top of spending and financed it by borrowing more and more money.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. What the gentleman from Texas is saying, I take it, is that in an ideal world, Congresses over the past 30 or 40 years would have made those tough decisions and we would not need either Gramm-Rudman or the balanced-budget amendment. But human nature being what it is, those decisions have not been made by Congresses, and that is why we need the framework of Gramm-Rudman-Mack, and that is why we need the balanced-budget amendment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. That brings to mind a comment that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in the other body made when this was being debated in the other body. He said, "We sit here arguing about what kind of fire extinguisher to use while the fire rages out of control." And we now have a fire extinguisher. We do not have an acceptable alternative. To my knowledge, there is not even another alternative being proposed. So let us use Gramm-Rudman and begin to put the fire out.

Mr. SWINDALL. If the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman mentioned the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, because I think that the fact that he, a Democrat, is supporting this bill really gets to the heart of this issue, and that is that this is not a Republican issue, this is not a Democratic issue, it is not a conservative issue, it is not a liberal issue. I think it can best be framed by being stated that it is either a responsible issue or an irresponsible issue. That is really the watershed in this debate. Are we going to be responsible for our action? Or are we going to continue with the same vein of irresponsibility that we have followed for years now?

One of the things that I was most intrigued by was the budget process, because as I began to talk to individuals—and I will just take one example, the agriculture portion of the budget—I looked at individuals that I knew to be on the Agriculture Committee. I said, "Let me ask you something. Is this realistic?" I think it was about \$18.9 billion. And the individual said, "Well, not really." I said, "Well, how can you pass this budget?" He said, "Because we will come back and get a supplemental later."

The truth of the matter is that budget means nothing. It is simply some procedure that we go through each year, so that we can tell the public that we have met our responsibility of saying what we are going to spend money on and how much, and they believe us year after year after year, but they do not watch, because we hide it with these various supplementals that keep throwing the budget way out of kilter. And all in world Gramm-Rudman says is, let us have truth in budgeting. We have truth in lending, we have truth in everything else. Why do we not have truth in budgeting, so that when we establish a budget we tell the American people we are going to live by it, and if we do not live by it and we are fooling the American people, then this procedure automatically makes us live by it. How could anyone be opposed to that?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The gentleman from Georgia makes an excellent point. He brings to mind a question that I have been asked in my district

about the Gramm-Rudman proposal. The question goes as follows: Under the current Budget Act that we have, theoretically a balanced budget is required. In practice, we waive that here on the House floor almost daily. By a rule from the Rules Committee we waive the Budget Act. What would prevent us from waiving the requirements of Gramm-Rudman?

Very simply, under Gramm-Rudman you cannot just waive the act by a rule of the House of Representatives. In order to waive it, Congress has to declare a national war, a recession has to be predicted by both the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, or the Congress has to pass a law, the House of Representatives has to pass a law waiving the requirements of the act. The other body of the Congress has to pass the identical law, and the President of the United States has to sign that law. If those three events do not happen, then you cannot waive the requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Mack.

Mr. SWINDALL. If the gentleman will yield, there is one other point that I think is very apropos at this point, and that is this point: If the President, which I am confident he will, vetoes such a bill, it comes back to this House, and I am confident that we can find one-third that will sustain the veto. The reason I am confident is, the gentleman from Texas remembers we sent a letter to the White House, a number of us, 154, if I remember correctly, signed that letter, stating we would sustain his veto on any appropriation measures that was a budget-buster.

So my point is, that is the major differentiation between what has been happening under the Budget Act of 1974 and what will happen once Gramm-Rudman is passed, and that is if the President vetoes it, we can sustain that veto, but we cannot get necessarily the 50 percent, plus one votes that are necessary to prevent waiving the rule the way we do year after year, after year.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I feel very confident that we would be able to sustain such a vote if the President did veto such a bill.

I notice that my distinguished colleague from Texas, Congressman ARMEY, is in the Chamber. I would be happy to yield to him for any remarks he cares to make on this issue.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, I would like to begin my remarks by applauding the gentleman for taking out this special order. I have been sitting here listening to the debate. I think one of the things I would like to point out is that there have been four of us now in this special order that have spoken, and I think every one of the four of us is a new Congressman. We represent a

cross-cut of the Nation, of course. We have Washington State, up in the Northwest, we have Georgia in the Southeast, and of course we have the great State of Texas, which amounts to three-fourths of the land surface of the United States. Everything else is called "ain't Texas." So I think, Joe, you and I can represent a good point of view. Nobody has ever suggested that people from Texas are reluctant to speak more than their fair share of the time.

Let me just make a few comments. I have been watching the debate. I think one point you are making is very clear. We have the deficit problem and the \$2 trillion debt because we have lacked discipline. Gramm-Rudman-Mack gives us a framework where discipline will be imposed on this body. We will have to work within limits.

Now, one of the problems that I perceived over the past 10 years is that the House of Representatives, indeed the entire legislative process, has not recognized that the Federal Government has to live within its limits, just as you and I do in our homes.

Now, all of a sudden, we will have defined limits. Then we are faced with a problem: in order to live within those limits, must we either raise taxes or cut spending? And there is really going to be no two ways about it, because the borrowing option will be removed from us.

One of the concerns I have is—you talked about are there other alternatives being suggested to the Gramm-Rudman-Mack proposal—that the conference may recommend an alternative that will encourage tax increases.

Now, say what you want, the numbers have proven to us, economic theory proves to us, cold, calculating logic proves to us, that if you cut taxes and if you let the working men and women of America take more money home, they will work harder. You and I do it. I remember when I was young, I used to turn down overtime because the tax bite did not make it worth my time. Reduce the tax bite, and I will work harder. American working men and women are trying to provide a better living for their families. They want to do it themselves.

We are not a nation of freeloaders. We are a hard-working Nation, and we do want the right to earn our own living and to keep what we earn. So we must avoid tax increases as an option to fulfilling these deficit targets.

The other is spending cuts. Now, one of the things I would like to suggest to you that this body begin to do is to think not only in terms of more or less spending, more or less of the same old programs, but let us talk about less spending on better programs. I will give you an example. We do want to subsidize the incomes of the needy people in America. We need to do that.

Any compassionate nation must care for its truly needy. And certainly this Nation will accept that responsibility. We have several programs by which we attempt to do this. One, in particular, I might spend a moment on is the Food Stamp Program.

Now, actually, what we do with the Food Stamp Program is, we spend too much money giving a subsidy that is not very effective in terms of the individual recipients because of the limitations we impose on them, a program that allows for and encourages and even in some cases demands cheating on the rules of the program—and we have all heard these stories—and also make it possible for greedy people to cheat on the qualification requirements.

Now, I think it is time we accept this fact. Nobody is going to deny it. People see it all the time. We know cases in point. There are welfare cheaters in this country. Now, what do they do? They qualify on the basis of trumped-up qualifications, and our law is not tight enough to not allow this.

Now, who gets hurt? Well, obviously the taxpayer. I, for one, and I believe, Joe, you, and I am sure the gentleman from Georgia, or any Member of this House, are perfectly understanding of the requirement and the necessity, the moral necessity of us as individuals to care for the truly needy. But by the same token, if we allow greedy people, without justification, to avail themselves of this care and of this subsidy to their income, we are doing the greatest harm possible to the needy because we allow them to be crowded out. We allow prejudice to be built up against them. I have seen that prejudice myself. I think it is terribly unfortunate. With the Food Stamp Program, we take the most distressed people in America, the people who really and truly do need a compassionate, helping hand, and we make these people a marked person in today's grocery lines.

□ 2100

Because the public at large know the cheaters are out there they become cynical and skeptical of everybody. I have seen a mother with her two children and people that to me seemed obvious to be in need be subjected to scorn because they had the food stamps in the grocery line and they were identified. I think that is one of the greatest tragedies of all.

We spend too much money; we do not differentiate between the really needy people in the Nation and those who would cheat on this largess. We allow then the needy people to have less resources for their income support and maintenance, and we leave them as marked people, subjected to all forms of humiliation.

What is a better way? We can actually reduce spending if we reform the

whole concept, we reform the whole approach and the approach has been recommended years ago. It is not something new; we have understood it in this country. Milton Friedman suggested it years ago, the negative income tax. A device by which we can indeed differentiate between those who need and those who do not. A way to get a greater increase in well being to the recipients per dollar of expenditure. More fairness to the taxpayers.

An ability for the individual recipient to be the best judge of how he or she will support their family. An opportunity for the poverty mother, that female head of a poverty household, to avoid the 150-percent tax penalty that falls on her if she does try to work her family up the occupational ladder. There is a better way to do this, and we can take the Gramm-Rudman-Mack initiative, put in place then the limits and then respond to those limits with a new sense of creativity, a heightened sense of compassion and understanding, and a greater awareness of how it is we can be fair not only to the truly needy people in America, protecting them from the abuses of the greedy in our country, and at the same time protect the rights of and have a compassionate use of the taxpayers' dollars.

That is the challenge that I see coming to this Congress after Gramm-Rudman. That is the challenge that I see the creativity in this Congress able to meet. What we have got to do now is accept the challenge, impose the discipline, use the creativity, and with less of our taxpayers' dollars, do a better job of helping the needy people in America defend our Nation, and create a more prosperous economy for all of us.

This is what I see as the hope that springs following Gramm-Rudman. Again, I would like to congratulate you for having the initiative to take this late hour, and it is a test of how much you do care about these problems that you are willing to be here this late.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from the 26th Congressional District of Texas for his comments. I could not agree more. I would point out that the first step is to pass Gramm-Rudman, to get the conference committee that is now in session to agree to that amendment. To bring it back before this body, let us vote on it, send it to the President for his signature, and then begin the process of getting spending under control.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, I will not belabor the point too much longer. I would like to finish up by summarizing very briefly, once again, what Gramm-Rudman does do. It is a 5-year emergency deficit reduction act. It sets deficit targets each year for the next 5 years, beginning at \$180 billion, declining to zero in fiscal year 1991. It re-

quires the President of the United States to submit a budget to the Congress, that falls within these deficit targets. The Congress may change those spending priorities around, but the Congress is required to come within the targets.

If the Congress does not, and only if the Congress does not pass legislation that is less than the spending targets, then automatically, in order to bring spending in conformity with the targets, its discretionary programs are cut, half of the spending reductions would come from the discretionary programs, and half of the spending reductions would come from mandated entitlement programs. The cuts would have to be proportional; everything would be subject to being cut, except for interest on the national debt and Social Security. All other programs could be cut.

The President would automatically begin these cuts if the Congress had acted without, and then if the President wanted to propose different types of cuts, he could do so but then the Congress would have the authority to override, to change those cuts.

If we pass this legislation in the near future, and we only have 10 days. We only have until November 1 to act affirmatively on this legislation because on that date all spending authority of the Federal Government runs out. All borrowing authority, I should say, the ability to borrow additional funds runs out.

But if we do that, then we have got a 5-year plan that will bring us back to a balanced budget. Hopefully, by that time we will have a constitutional amendment to our Constitution, requiring a balanced budget and we can go about the business of governing this country.

THE ABORTION ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to address this body this evening during special orders, and I recognize the lateness of the hour, but I did want to take just a few minutes to talk about a subject that is, hard as it may be to believe, even more important than the Gramm-Rudman bill. It is a topic that many of us really do not like to talk about. It is the topic of abortion.

I had not planned to talk about it today, but when I heard the rabbi from Miami deliver his prayer today, I was so inspired that I really felt it would only be appropriate to take a brief special order today to talk about that subject and the subject matter of his prayer.

In his prayer he made a very profound statement. That statement was, that one of the fundamental purposes of civil government is to assure truth, justice, and peace. Then he quoted from the Declaration of Independence. That portion that states that, "We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal. That they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

He then went on to talk about how precious life is and how we so frequently murder human individuals and that murder seems to occur in spite of the laws that we have established.

I am impressed by his statement that the Declaration of Independence sets forth that fundamental truth because I think that in that Declaration of Independence is an issue that perhaps we have not focused on when we talk about the abortion issue.

□ 2110

And that is that our Founding Fathers had the wisdom and the judgment to use their words very carefully. In fact, one Supreme Court decision stated:

The men who framed the Declaration of Independence were great men, high in literary requirements, high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used and how it would be understood by others.

The point I would like to make is that in the Declaration of Independence our Founding Fathers very carefully chose their words to state: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal." They did not say, "All Men are born equal." They said, "All Men are created equal."

The, "create," means to form. The significance of that, is that the same Declaration of Independence goes on to state, after making that profound statement: "That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted . . . deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed."

In other words, the purpose of civil government, even as our Founding Fathers drafted the Declaration of Independence, was then, and has always been, to protect human life, because individuals are created equal, and created with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to live.

After the Revolution, we know that these same men, or many of the same men gathered together, to draft the Constitution, and because they understood that we were not in this country a Democracy, they were, in fact, scared to death of a Democracy because they understood that in a free Democracy whatever the whim of the majority happened to be would

become the law simply because the majority outweighed the minority. Rather, we chose to become a constitutional Republic, the significance being that our laws would be based on this Constitution, and that no one could change the Constitution arbitrarily or whimsically, but, rather, the Constitution could only be changed in a prescribed fashion, a very arduous fashion.

It was later, years later, that we saw the first true test of our Constitution. That test occurred when a number of individuals who were very concerned about slavery in this country challenged the institutionalized practice of slavery by stating that our black brothers and sisters were entitled to constitutional protection because they were citizens or persons within the context and meaning of the Constitution.

Well, we all recall that the abolitionists were unsuccessful in their first attempt. That attempt was a judicial attempt, and in the Dred Scott decision, the Supreme Court rebuffed their attempt basically to forever prohibit slavery by holding that, the Constitution did not apply to our black brothers and sisters, because they were not persons as defined by the Constitution. In fact, if you go to the Dred Scott decision, which was decided in 1856, you will find that the crux of that case is contained in the holding found on pages 410 and 411, and follows under case head note 4 that stated that "a free Negro of the African race whose ancestors were brought to this country and sold as slaves, is not a 'citizen' within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States." Therefore none of these constitutional rights, including the right to freedom, attached.

Well, we recognized then, I think appropriately, that if we were a constitutional Republic and that our Constitution was to be above the manipulation of any group, even if it happened to be the Supreme Court, we could not allow that decision to stand. It was very obvious that the reason the Supreme Court decided, as it did, was because, quite frankly, the Supreme Court wanted to accommodate the socioeconomic pressures of the time. It would not have been very popular at that time to buck the system. So there in the Dred Scott decision they rendered literally, thousands of Americans to be without any rights whatsoever. Fortunately for us, we came along subsequent to that decision and amended the Constitution.

But what despaired those abolitionists at the time, history tells us, was the fact that as they read the Constitution, they could not find anywhere in the Constitution any definition of "personhood," and it despaired them worse that the Constitution, which was to be written or changed, only by

the consent of the governed, was suddenly manipulated by seven of nine individuals on the Supreme Court.

It occurred to me a number of years ago, as I compared this with the Roe against Wade decision, the decision of the Supreme Court in 1973 that in fact legalized abortion on demand, that there was a glaring similarity between the holding of the Roe against Wade decision, and the holding of the Dred Scott decision. In fact, interestingly and ironically, the Dred Scott decision was a 7 to 2 decision, and in the Roe against Wade decision, it was also 7 to 2. But if you look at the Roe against Wade decision, you will find that the Roe against Wade decision, did not turn on the issue of the right to privacy, as so many individuals have argued to me that it did, because the right to privacy is secondary to the more fundamental right to life.

If you go to the Roe against Wade decision, which is found at 410 U.S. Supreme Court at page 156, you will see the argument that the Supreme Court first had to deal with. There it states:

The appellee and certain amici argue that the fetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the 14th amendment. In support of this they outlined at length and in detail the well-known facts of fetal development. If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would then be guaranteed specifically by the amendment. The appellant conceded as much as on reargument. On the other hand, the appellee conceded on reargument that no case could be cited that holds that a fetus is a person within the meaning of the 14th amendment. The Constitution does not define "person" in so many words.

Further in the decision it states:

All this, together with our observation supra, that throughout the major portion of the 19th century prevailing legal abortion practices were far freer than they are today, persuades us that the word, "person" as used in the 14th amendment does not include the unborn.

So precisely the same whimsical 7 to 2 decision, forever changed the fate and the destiny of over 18 million unborn children in the United States, for since the Roe against Wade decision in 1973, over 18 million abortions have occurred. In fact, today one-third of all pregnancies are terminated in abortion.

My concern about that is that irrespective of how one might decide the issue of abortion, one must first look at the fact that we have gone about it, in a fashion that is totally contrary to our constitutional values, because in reality what we have said is that this Constitution is whatever the Supreme Court wants it to be. If we concede that the Supreme Court has a right to define "person" to exclude the unborn, in spite of the fact that the Declaration of Independence said that we are all created equal, with certain

unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that same Supreme Court may well one day take the next step and say, "Well, what about the quality of each individual even after they are born?"

In fact, I think Francis Schaeffer, the renowned theologian who died several years ago, said in 1972, the year before the Roe against Wade decision, that if we ever conceded the right to abortion on demand in this country, what would necessarily follow would be infanticide, and ultimately euthanasia, the theory being that once you devalue human life or make that a subjective decision by individuals on the Supreme Court, you have opened Pandora's box to the point that any type of subjective interpretation can change the meaning to fit the socioeconomic mores of the time.

□ 2120

In fact, we are well aware today that there is a very hot debate as to whether or not our children that are now, say, born with certain deformities have a right to live because they do not meet our subjective opinion of what constitutes the right quality of life.

We have also heard individuals argue that our elderly have an obligation to step aside, that they really ought not to continue to live because they have nothing to offer society. It is a very utilitarian viewpoint.

What frightens me about that is who is going to continue to make these decisions in terms of what is the right quality of life? A number of individuals have said that, in fact, we ought to continue to allow abortion under Roe against Wade decision, and the decisions that have followed simply because of these children that have been murdered, are not wanted. That is ludicrous on its face when you recognize that in Atlanta, GA, there is a 10-year wait list for infant adoptions.

I think the real issue is, wanted by whom? They may be unwanted by the natural parents, but they are certainly wanted by at least enough individuals, to make the wait list 10 years in Atlanta, longer in a number of other areas.

By the same token, I read in a Time magazine article several years ago that said individuals pay \$40,000 to \$50,000 for infant children on the black market. That is how difficult it is to find infants.

I talk to adoptive parents all the time that say they would give anything if they could adopt yet another child, but it is too difficult to find one.

What does that have to do with the prayer that I heard this morning? What it has to do with is that we have strayed so far from that ideal that we founded this Nation on, and that was the ideal that civil government was instituted to protect human life from the moment of creation forward.

Many people argue to me, "Well, how do you know at what moment creation occurs?"

Well, I do not have much difficulty with that, but even if I did, I think that same Constitution tells us that in this country we are fortunate in that we are innocent until proven guilty under our Constitution; my point being that before that we continue to murder innocent children, someone ought to at least step forward and meet the burden of proof and show their guilt.

We actually show more deference to criminals than we do to our unborn. At least they must stand before a jury of their peers and have not just a preponderance of the evidence, but evidence beyond a reasonable doubt presented of their guilt.

So we have totally ignored due process. We have totally ignored equal protection under the law, and quite simply we have totally ignored our Constitution.

In conclusion, I would say that the solution to this problem is really a very simple one, and that is, it is the same solution that we utilized over 100 years ago when we rectified the wrong done by the Dred Scott decision. That is, we recognized that if we are to be a constitutional republic, there are ways to change the Constitution lawfully, and that is through the constitutional amendment process.

It is for that reason that I am a strong advocate of at least debating on the floor of this House, for the first time since the Roe against Wade decision, the propriety of a constitutional amendment to either reverse or in-state in a lawful constitutional manner the Roe against Wade decision.

How could anyone, irrespective of their ultimate view on that issue, possibly argue with protecting the sanctity of this Constitution?

If you happen to believe in abortion on demand, then at least allow a constitutional amendment, and if in fact the requisite number of States ratify that constitutional amendment, you will have the Constitution intact along with this new body of law.

If, on the other hand, you disagree with the right to abortion on demand, and believe that in fact civil government is established to protect human life, you will have an opportunity to vote in such a fashion as to ratify a different constitutional amendment.

But my point is, America can ill afford to tear down the very document that has served as a foundation for this country's prosperity. We almost destroyed it with the Dred Scott decision, but thank God we showed the good judgment to override it with a constitutional amendment.

It seems inconsistent to me that anyone could be opposed to slavery and not opposed to the Roe against

Wade decision which legalized abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to take another special order, where I will go into much greater detail about a number of the issues that I only touched on tonight, but I did want to at least take this opportunity because of the time limits of the rabbi's remarks this morning, as he opened this day in Congress to illustrate how far we have varied from the basic tenets set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NIELSON of Utah) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. IRELAND, for 5 minutes, on October 23.

Mr. MILLER of Washington, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Washington, for 60 minutes, on October 24.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GEEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 60 minutes, on October 29.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. COURTER, for 60 minutes, on October 30.

Mr. SWINDALL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MACK, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOWRY of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DYMALLY, for 60 minutes, on October 23.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, on November 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NIELSON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. MCCAIN.

Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. ROGERS.
Mr. LENT.
Mr. COATS.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. COURTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Lowry of Washington) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARCIA in four instances.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. OBEY.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. ECKART of Ohio.
Mr. HUGHES.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. YATRON.
Mr. WEISS.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. DYSON.
Mr. COELHO in two instances.
Mr. MITCHELL.
Mrs. COLLINS.
Mr. WIRTH.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. APPELGATE in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. WHEAT.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2959. An act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning October 6, 1985, as "National Children's Week."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1726. An act to amend section 51(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, relating to the funding of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund.

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to designate October 1985 as "National Foster Grandparent Month."

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On October 18, 1985:

H.R. 2174. An act to provide for the transfer to the Colville Business Council of any undistributed portion of amounts appropriated in satisfaction of certain judgments awarded the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation before the Indian Claims Commission.

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to designate November 24, 1985, as "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 1985, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2161. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting information concerning the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Jordan for defense articles estimated to cost \$50 million or more, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2162. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting information concerning the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Jordan for defense articles estimated to cost \$50 million or more, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2163. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting studies of voluntary agreements under section 708 of the Defense Production Act, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2158(k); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2164. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed letters of offer to Jordan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$75 million, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2165. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Departments of the Air Force and the Army's proposed letters of offer to Jordan for defense articles and services estimated to cost up to \$1.8 billion, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2166. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health Operations and Director, Office of Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting an annual report on the financial condition of the pension plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2167. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting notice of a proposed al-

teration to a records system entitled, "Attorney Assignment Record," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2168. A letter from the Vice President of Human Resources, Farm Credit Banks of Springfield, transmitting the annual report covering April 1, 1984 through March 31, 1985, of the Farm Credit Banks of Springfield retirement plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2169. A letter from the Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the findings of the Secretary of the Army's investigation into allegations of a violation of law and abuse of authority by officials at Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, IL, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2170. A letter from the Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report responding to the allegations of mismanagement, waste of funds and danger to public safety on the electrical contract at the Lower Mason Complex, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, National Park Service, San Francisco, CA, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2171. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft to proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize modification of the structure of the Office of the Chief Medical Director, to clarify procedures for removal for cause of certain employees, to authorize the use of the director pay grade within VA Central Office and for related purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on the origin, contents, destination and disposition of all humanitarian goods and supplies to countries in Central America, pursuant to Public Law 95-525, section 1540(e) (98 Stat. 2638); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2173. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to except all positions in the Drug Enforcement Administration from the competitive service, and place the incumbents of such positions in the expected service; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1083. A bill to amend the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act to improve procedures for the implementation of compacts providing for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-314, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 862. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Northwest

Interstate Compact on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management; with amendments (Rept. 99-315, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1046. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Central Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact; with amendments (Rept. 99-316, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1267. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact; with amendments (Rept. 99-317, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2062. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Central Midwest Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact; with amendments (Rept. 99-318, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2635. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Midwest Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact; with amendments (Rept. 99-319, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2702. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Rocky Mountain Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact; with amendments (Rept. 99-320, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 3592. A bill to provide permanent authority for hearing commissioners in the D.C. courts, to modify certain procedures of the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission and the D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 3593. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the use of dogs at major airports for the purpose of detecting plastic explosives and other devices which may be used in aircraft piracy and which cannot be detected by metal detectors; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3594. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to enhance retirement security by broadening retirement benefit delivery, strengthening the present system of voluntary employer-sponsored pensions, and encouraging growth and development of the private pension system by simplifying the administration of pension plans; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBEY (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 3595. A bill to provide financial assistance for the Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Program in Public Affairs at the North Carolina State University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 3596. A bill to encourage the use of public school facilities before and after school hours for the care of school age children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

H.R. 3597. A bill entitled, the "Indian Economic Development Act of 1985"; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Ways and Means, and Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 3598. A bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of oppression in Angola, to promote the development of democracy in Angola, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 3599. A bill to suspend temporarily most-favored-nation treatment to Romania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWINDALL:

H.R. 3600. A bill to limit the number of Soviet nationals serving at the Soviet mission to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SYNAR:

H.R. 3601. A bill to authorize the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma to design and construct hydroelectric power facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 3602. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to waive, for 5 years, the 24-month waiting period for medicare eligibility on the basis of a disability in the case of individuals with acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS], and the other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COBEY (for himself and Mr. Towns):

H.J. Res. 424. Joint resolution to designate the year of 1986 as the "Year of the Flag"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.J. Res. 425. Joint resolution concerning the cruel and inhuman killing of Leon Klinghoffer by international terrorists aboard the cruise ship *Achille Lauro*, because he did not submit to the demands of the terrorists; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MONSON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. COBEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. STRANG, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should declare a state of national emergency with respect to terrorist acts committed against citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OAKER:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution authorizing use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony incident to placement of a bust of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in the Capitol and authorizing printing of the transcript of proceedings of that ceremony; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

274. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to national recognition of Haym Salomon; to the Committee on House Administration.

275. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to Federal transportation assistance programs; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

276. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to income tax deductions for repairing and remodeling expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

277. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to Canadian timber imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3603. A bill for the relief of Mouris Hakim Ibrahim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3604. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Moreno Nite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 147: Mr. LOTT.
H.R. 230: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 580: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
H.R. 776: Mr. McGRATH and Mr. CHAPPIE.
H.R. 822: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 945: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. RAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. STRANG, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. BOULTER, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1099: Mr. SUNIA.
H.R. 1197: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1294: Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 1356: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SWINDALL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1398: Mr. FROST, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1400: Mr. AKAKA.
H.R. 1423: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1458: Mrs. LONG.
H.R. 1538: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1550: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.
H.R. 1669: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. KOLTER,

Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1715: Mr. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 1769: Mr. HATCHER and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1918: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1924: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1973: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 2277: Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 2295: Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2320: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2481: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2591: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 2661: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 2854: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 2907: Mr. DYSON, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2954: Mr. SWINDALL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2999: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 3006: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 3042: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 3045: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3090: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 3100: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BEILSON, and Mr. BONKER.

H.R. 3132: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 3173: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3202: Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 3259: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 3263: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 3292: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BILEY, Mr. SWINDALL, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 3330: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 3371: Mr. WHITTAKER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3464: Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FRANKLIN.

H.R. 3512: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. WEISS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 3515: Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 3522: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 3530: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FREN-

ZEL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 3531: Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 3542: Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. FLIPPO.

H.J. Res. 279: Mr. SWINDALL.

H.J. Res. 282: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mrs. LONG.

H.J. Res. 321: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.J. Res. 345: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CONTE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. McGRATH, Mrs. LONG, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. LENT, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. McHUGH.

H.J. Res. 401: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LUEN, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.J. Res. 421: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. ARCHER.

H. Con. Res. 201: Mr. WEISS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. RUDD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Res. 40: Mr. DAUB, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. COATS, and Mr. SWINDALL.

H. Res. 194: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H. Res. 219: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H. Res. 245: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLF.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2781: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Office of the Finance Director and City Clerk, West Monroe, LA, relative to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

237. Also, petition of Jerome Strager, Sandstone, MN, relative to antisemitism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. Petition of the City Council of Seal Beach, CA, relative to Federal income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.